A

DISCOURSE

Concerning

SANCHONIATHON's

Phœnician Hiſtory.

By *HENRY DODWELL, M. A.*
and ſometimes Fellow of Trinity Colledge *near* Dublin *in* Ireland.

LONDON,
Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*, and Sold by *Samuel Simpſon* and *Richard Green*, Bookſellers in *Cambridge*, 1691.

THE CONTENTS.

THE Occaſion *of this Diſcourſe*, §. I. *The* Uſefulneſs, §. II. *The* Credit *of* Sanchoniathon's *Work depends either on* Porphyry, *or* Philo Byblius, §. III. *The* Philoſophers *allowed a Liberty of* Beneficial Falſehoods; *and they who firſt produced this Author were, in* Intereſt *concerned for him*, §. IV. Theodoret *and* Cyril *of* Alexandria *quote him only at the ſecond hand from* Euſebius. *Several groſs miſtakes of* Cyril, §. V, VI. Sanchoniathon *very little known* before *he was produced by* Porphyry, §. VII, VIII. *No reaſon why he might not have been known, even* before *the time of* Philo Byblius, *if he had been really genuine*, §. IX. *He might have been taken notice of, not only as a* Hiſtorian, *but as a* Philoſopher, §. X. *Concerning his* Means *of* Information. *The* Writings *of* Taautus. *The Antient way of preſerving* Antiquities *by* Inſcriptions *on* Sacred Pillars, *ſometimes* abuſed, *and very* fit *for the deſigns of* Deceivers, §. XI. *This was generally pretended to by thoſe who Rivalled each other for* Antiquity. *The* Pro-

phecy *of* Cham *and the* Pillars *of* Seth *contained the ſame Doctrines with thoſe of* Mercury, §. XII, XIII. Taautus *the ſame with* Mercury. *The* Ammonian Philoſophy *the ſame with the* Ægyptian §. XIV. *It is improbable that* Sanchoniathon *could derive his Information from the* Books *of* Mercury, §. XV. Mercury a Phœnician, §. XVI. *The Pretences of* Philo Byblius *for defence of his Author* §. XVII. *It is not probable that the Antient* Ægyptians *would have ſuffered* Mercury *to have* Revealed *their* Myſteries §. XVIII. *It is not probable that the* Ægyptian Mercury *either* would *or could have* Revealed *them*, §. XIX. *The Story of* Thabion *perhaps the* Second Mercury *called* Agathodæmon. *He is ſuppoſed to be the Author of the Modern* Greek Writing *Fathered on* Mercury (*which if meant by* Sanchoniathon *muſt be a certain Conviction of his Falſe-hood*) *perhaps firſt publiſhed by* Numenius, §. XX. *By* Hierom-baal *Prieſt of the God* Jevo *he meant* Gideon. Sanchoniathon *could not miſtake him for a* Prieſt. Bochart *miſtaken* §. XXI. *It is not Credible that* Gideon *ever left any* Memoirs *behind him*, §. XXII. Sanchoniathons *account of* Jewiſh *Affairs could not have been taken from thence* §. XXIII.

§. XXIII. Intrinsick *Arguments of just Suspicion against this Author. His arrogating to his* own Country *the Glory of all famous* Persons *and* Inventions, §. XXIV. *Several Instances hereof*, §. XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII. *An Account of the design of* Philo Byblius *in this Imposture. He was disaffected to the* Jews, *and perhaps set on this design by occasion of* Josephus's *Books against* Appion, §. XXIX. Josephus *there insisted more particularly on the Testimonies of* Phœnicians. *Other things that recommended the* Jewish Scriptures *to the esteem of the* Learned Heathens *of that Age. Several Eminent* Jewish *Writers who, by* Mystical *Expositions, brought their own Doctrines near the received* System *of the* Dogmatical Philosophers, §. XXX. Heathen Oracles *in favour of the* Jews *owned for genuine by the* Heathens *themselves. The good Characters of* Abraham *and* Moses *in the received* Orphaicks. Joseph *and* Moses *taken for* Ægyptian Priests, §. XXXI. *A sect of* Philosophers, *several of them* Antienter *than* Philo Byblius, *who received the Authority of* Moses *as a Wise* Legislator *and a* Prophet, *and mentioned him with respect.* Chalcidius *a* Heathen, §. XXXII. *The* Jewish Κοσμογονία *taken into*

into the counterfeited Works of Hermes, *about the time of* Philo Byblius, §. XXXIII. *How this might come to pass*, §. XXXIV. Philo Byblius's *Partiality appears in his making* Sanchoniathon *prefer his own City* Byblos *before all the Cities of* Phœnicia *for Antiquity, even before* Berytus *it self. Why he makes his* Sanchoniathon *enquire into the* Archives *of the* particular Cities, §. XXXV. *He had, in this Work, a particular design upon the* Jews. *Why he makes his* Sanchoniathon *live in the time of* Abibalus, §. XXXVI. *The time of* Sanchoniathon *fixed, not by the Age of* Semiramis, *but of* Abibalus. *His time, by the* Tyrian Records, *either* Equal, *or a little* before *the War of* Troy, §. XXXVII. *Why he was to Father his* Informations, *concerning* Jewish *Matters, on a* Jew *and a* Priest, §. XXXVIII. *Why on a Priest of the* God Jevo, *and on* Gedeon *particularly. How he might from his* Name *collect his being a* Priest. Hierombaal, ירעי *and* גרעין, §. XXXIX. *Why he was to begin with a* Κοσμογονία. *All Books concerning* Ægyptian Notions *Fathered on* Hermes. *The Fashion of Fathering all* latter *Inventions of a* Sect *on the* First Author *of it, especially in their* Dialogues, §. XL. *The* Ægyptian Philosophy *followed by* Sanchoniathon

niathon. *How he ſecured himſelf from ſuſpicion of miſtake in* Interpreting Mercury. *How the* Greeks *came to be miſtaken*, §. XLI. *How the* Ægyptians. τετυμδς. Ἀπόκρυφα γεγράμματα, §. XLII. *How* Philo Byblius *ſecures his* Sanchoniathon *from the Suſpicion of* Fabling, *and* what Fables *he means*, §. XLIII, XLIV. *Yet he forgot himſelf and Fathered a* Scandalous Fable *upon him*, §. XLV. *The Name of* Sanchoniathon *perhaps borrowed from the Famous* Ægyptian Sonchis. *The* Atlantick Theology *probably the ſame with that of* Mercury, §. XLVI. *Recapitulation*, §. XLVII. *The* Scripture *needs no Confirmation from* Heathen *Authors*, §. XLVIII.

A DISCOURSE, Concerning SANCHONIATHON's Phœnician History.

In Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. 1. ch. 10.

§. I. HAVING in the latter of these Letters intimated some suspicion concerning the genuineness of *Sanchoniathon*, and considering how generally Learned men receive and quote him for an Author of that Antiquity he pretends to; as it will become me to purge my self from the suspicion of *Heterodoxy*, so I believe it will not be ingrateful to the ingenious inquisite Reader to understand what may be said concerning him. Which I shall do from some Letters which passed between me and a Learned Friend concerning him before the Publication of these *Letters* of *Advice*, and which, were in truth, the Reasons of my passing that censure upon him. N. IX. Dr. *Thomas Smith* Fellow of *Magdalen* College in *Oxford*.

§. II. THE *Credit* of this Author does the rather deserve an accurate and impartial Examination, because of the great use which is made of him in clearing several

ral *Historical* and *Philosophical* passages of the *Old Testament*; and because he is generally taken for the *Faithfullest*, and *Antientest*, and consequently the most *useful Heathen Author* that was extant within the Memory of Learned Ages. Which might make all who either have formerly, or do still believe him so, think nothing too difficult to be confirmed by his Credit.

(*) His very *Name* was observed to signifie φιλαληθὴς, which if it were given him by his *Contemporaries*, must needs have been a great attestation of his *Integrity* from them who had best reason to know him.* As for his *Age*, he is pretended equal to *Abibalus*, to whom he is said to have Dedicated this his *Phœnician History*, that *Abibalus*, I mean who, by the *Phœnician*

(*) So *Theodoret. Therap.* II. Σαγχωνιάθων, ὁ κατὰ τῶν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον φιλαληθὴς, &c. And so his *Translator*. But I had rather correct him from *Eusebius* whom he Transcribes; who, in two places where he has occasion to cite this same passage, agrees with *himself*, and yet differs from *Theodoret*. So therefore he: Σαγχωνιάθων, ὁ κατὰ τῶν Φοινίκων φιλαλήθως, &c. Συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγράψας. Reading φιλαλήθως for φιλαληθὴς; and opposing *Sanchoniathon*'s writing in the *Phœnician* to the *Greek* Translation of him by *Philo Byblius*, and referring φιλαλήθως to what follows συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγράψας not to *Sanchoniathon* mentioned before. *Pr. Eu. l.* 10. *X.* 91. And then there will appear no footsteps of any *Etymology* of his Name. Yet *Bochart* gives a likely *Etimology* for that purpose, which, if it hold, will shew, at least, a design of *Philo Byblius* in giving him that particular Name. * *Euseb. Pr. Ev. l.* 10. 31. A. X. 9. 485. *Theodoret Therap.* II.

Records,

ecords, is ſuppoſed to be the Father of *Hie-*
enus or *Eiromus*, conceived to be the
me with *Hiram*, contemporary with
avid and *Solomon* as appears, not only
om the *Scriptures*, but alſo from the ſame
henician Records, on whoſe credit, no
oubt, it is that *Joſephus* makes the
leventh year compleat, or Twelfth
egun of *Hiram*, to concur with the
ourth of *Solomon*, wherein the
emple was built. For he had the
um of thoſe Records Collected to his hand
y *Menander Epheſius* and *Dius*
nd *Hieronymus Tyrius*, and others,
ithout whoſe aſſiſtance he could
ot have been ſo particular in fix-
ng the certain year of *Hiram*.
The Learned *Bochart* would have this
Abibalus King of *Berytus* diſtinct from
him who was King of *Tyre*, and *Antienter*.
But if the account hold which we ſhall
afterwards give from the *Phœnician* Re-
cords, to ſhew him to have been *Equal* or
a *little Ancienter* than the War of *Troy*,
(exactly as this *Abibalus* the Father of *Hi-*
ram is placed by them who mention him)
it will then appear that no other was meant
than the Father of *Hiram*. That he is
called King of the *Bertyans*, was for no
other end but to ſignifie that he was *San-*
choniathon's

XI° *Hirami*, Ant. viii. 2. p. 759. Ed. *Gene.* xii°. c. *App.* l. 1. p. 1043.

Vid. *Joſeph.* Ant. viii. 2. Cont. *Appion.* L. 1. *Theoph. Antioch.* L. iii. ad *Autolyc.*

choniathon's Prince who was of *Berytus*, exactly as *Sanchoniathon* himself is in *Athenæus* and *Suidas* made a *Tyrian*, because his *Berytus* was, in his time, under the Jurisdiction of *Tyre*, which is again another probability that his *Abibalus* was the same with the K. of *Tyre*. *Porphyry* himself who first produced this *Sanchoniathon* against the *Christians*, makes him equal to *Semiramis*, who as he tells us in *Eusebius*'s *Preparation*, was either before or equal to the Wars of *Troy*; but he is confuted by *Eusebius* who makes her Eight hundred and fifty years earlier then that same War. Her Husband *Ninus* is generally, by *Heathen* Authors, made the utmost Period of all Histories they were acquainted with, who yet mention many things Antienter than that War of *Troy*. But this matter is excellently accounted for by the Learned and Judicious Sir *John Marsham*, who shews that *Porphyry* herein followed the more likely account of *Herodotus*, though *Ctesias*'s larger account had the luck to be more received. *Dioces* (the First King of the *Medes* after their revolt from the *Assyrians* according to *Herodotus*,) began his Reign *Olymp.* 17. 4. according to *Eusebius*. The *whole time* of the *Assyrians* was Five hundred and Twenty years ac-

Pr. Eu. l. 9. p. 31. B.

Chron. L. 11. init.

Tertul. de Pal. c. 2. ubi *Salmas.* & a *Cerda.*

Euf. Pr. Ev. x. 9. p. 485. 486.

Macrob. in somn. Scrip 11. 19.

Oros. L. 1.

Chron. Can. Ægypt. Sec. xvii. p. 522. Edit. *Lips.*

Euf. Chron. *Herodot.* l. 1. c.

cording to *Herodotus*. If therefore we reckon backward from that Fourth year of the Seventeenth *Olympiad*, the time of *Semiramis* who ſucceeded her Husband *Ninus*, will fall out much about the time where *Porphyry* places it. Nor was *Porphyry* alone, though he had indeed few Companions, in following *Herodotus*. He ſhews that *Appian* did ſo too, and the moſt Judicious *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*, and *Joſephus*. And, which is more particularly obſervable to our preſent purpoſe, *Philo Byblius* alſo agrees with him in placing *Semiramis* later then uſually, whom he makes Two thouſand years *later* than the Building of *Babylon*. Beſides the *Authenticalneſs* of the Records, from whence he derived his Information, is extremely conſiderable (if it ſhould prove really what it is pretended) the Sacred Writings of *Taautus*, that is *Mercury*, (of whom there is ſo much mention in thoſe yet earlier *Times*, of which he wrote his Hiſtory) the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμωνίων γράμματα. *Euſ. Pr. Ev.* l. 9. 32. B. the Ὑπομνήματα of *Hierombaal* Prieſt of the God *Jevo. ib.* p. 31. the Ὑπομνήματα of their Cities, and the Διαγραφαὶ of their Temples, *Ib.* But as ſo great Recommendations of *Fidelity*, of *Antiquity*, and ſufficient means of *Information*

Appian, Præf. *Dion. Halicarn.* L. 1. *Philo* ap. *Steph. Ba.*

Philo Byblius ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. 31. D.

mation, must needs make him very useful for the Discovery of many and momentous *Truths*, if justly challenged; so, on the contrary, must they make his Authority very mischievous for seducing those, who trust it, into numerous and dangerous *Errors*, if they should after all be found *False* and *Groundless*. Let us see therefore, whether these challenges be as *just* as they are specious and *plausible*

§. III. AND here I consider First, that all these Arguments of his Credibility depend, as to Us, either on the pure Testimony of *Porphyry*, who was the first who produced him with any great applause and confidence, and who is therefore justly suspicious, if not of wholly coyning him, yet at least of a partial favour to him, and of the first endeavours to justifie and defend him after the neglects that had been cast upon him since the time that he had first been Published and Translated by *Philo Byblius*, or else of *Philo Byblius* himself. *Athenæus* is the only Author extant that quoted him, that we know of, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*, supposing that the Σαγχωνιάθων, whose *Phœnician* Antiquities are quoted by him, and joyned with *Mochus* another very Antient *Phœnician* Writer often taken notice of, were

Athen. Deipnos. L. 3.

the

ſame with our *Sanchoniathon*, as he is ommonly conceived to be, and I believe, improbably, though he in *Athenæus* s a *Tyrian*, ours a *Berytian*, a difference very difficultly reconcileable, as has en ſhewn. If it ſhould prove otherwiſe, en *Porphyry* alone muſt anſwer for both, only the pretended *Sanchoniathon* mſelf, but the pretended *Greek* Tranſla- on alſo of him by *Philo Byblius*. But allow him all the favour that is reaſon- le, and to grant that this *Philo Byblius* to be ſuſpected of the Original fraud, ecauſe of this more Antient citation of m by *Athenæus*, which could have been om none but *Philo Byblius*; yet *Porphyry* uſt needs be looked on as the *retriever* a *neglected*, and therefore *ſuſpicious* uthor, who muſt have been by that time ery Famous, if he had been thought enuine, which is very conſiderable for y preſent purpoſe.

§. IV. FOR I conſider further, that as e Principles both of the *Pytha-* *raans* and *Platoniſts* (who were oth of them admired by *Porphyry*) llowed the Lawfulneſs of *Medici-* falſehoods, as they called them hich was no doubt the Original ſt of thoſe *Mythological* Stories

For the *Pythagoræans*, ſee *Tim. Locr. περ. φυσ. κόσμ.* For the *Platoniſts*, *Plato* himſelf *de Rep.* L. 3. v. S. *Hieronym.* adv. *Ruff.* L. 1.

with

with which they first beautified their *Dialogues*, then of all those *Forgeries* which were afterwards introduced by the *Monks*, who from their first Institution were of a *Philosophical* Extraction and Genius; I say besides these *Principles* which may let us see that it was *possible* he *might* deal disingenuously with us; the *occasion* of his first producing him, and his *design*, were such as may make him further suspicious of using the utmost liberty of his Principles *actually*. For it was purposely to confront the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures*, and in that very work which was designed to overthrow the Credit of *Christianity*. The like I shall (*) hereafter observe concerning *Philo Byblius*.

See the words of *Porphyry* in *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. X. 9. *Theodoret* Therap. 11.

* §. 36.

§. V. BUT that I may not therefore conclude him guilty of a disingenuous *Fact*, only because it was agreeable, not only to *Principles*, but his *Design*, and *Interest*; Let us consider the thing it self, and see whether it be likely that either *Sanchoniathon*, or his Translator *Philo Byblius*, were ever had in any esteem till *Porphyry* vouched for them. If they were, how comes it to pass that none but *Athenæus* should take notice of an Author so extreamly

treamly valuable, if he had been genuine! How comes it to paſs, that thoſe few *Chriſtians* that mention him afterwards ſhould quote him only at the *Second hand* from *Euſebius*, or at the uttermoſt from *Porphyry*? Why had they not rather recourſe to *Philo Byblius* himſelf, if he had been common? And what imaginable reaſon is there why he ſhould not have been *Common*, eſpecially in thoſe Eaſtern parts ſo near *Phœnicia*, if he had been valued, or thought genuine? Yet (a) *Theodoret* it ſeems had never ſeen him, but only in *Euſebius*. (b) St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was ſo far from quoting what he had occaſion to produce out of him from the Original of *Philo Byblius*, as that his memory, on which he ſeems to have quoted him from *Euſebius*, betrayed him into ſeveral and great miſtakes. He firſt pretends to have had what he ſays concerning him from *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Stromatæ*. A plain ſign he had not ſeen *Philo Byblius* himſelf. Yet who can doubt but that he alſo miſtook *Clemens Alexandrinus* for *Euſebius*? It is certain there is no mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Tranſlator* in the *Stromatæ* of *Clemens* as we have them extant at preſent. Was it therefore what is loſt? There are but two Imper-

(a) *Therap.* II. III. from *Euſ.* Pr.Ev.x.9.

(b) *Cont. Julian.*l.vi.

fections in the whole Work, the beginning of the *First* Book, and the *Eighth*. What was wanting in the beginning of the *First Book*, we know by what remains to have been nothing but Introduction, where he had yet no occasion of medling with the *Antiquity* of *Phœnician* Writers. Not in the *Eighth Book*, where by what he promises in the *Sixth*, we know he designed to answer the Heathens concerning the *Coming of our Lord*, that is, I suppose, concerning his *coming so lately*, and in so *mean appearance* (which were the Popular Objections of that Age) or else concerning his *Second coming* to Judge *Persecutors* and *Unbelievers*, which ordinarily concluded their *Controversial Writings*. So the Sacred Writers of the *New Testament* frequently. So St. *Cyprian's* Second Book of *Testimonies*, *ad Quirin.* which seems to have been the *last* of that Work. So *Irenæus* in the last Chapters *adv. Hær.* So *Lactantius Lib. VII. Div. Inst. Phil. Commodianus* is more particularly large on this Argument. But neither of these could afford him any occasion of mentioning this Author. For none can doubt but what now, and in *Photius's* time, possessed the place of the *Eighth* Book had no affinity with the Argument

Strom. VI. p. 617. A.

Cod cxi.

of

of this Work. And yet neither is there any mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Translator*. But to put the matter out of doubt that this was only a miſtake of St. *Cyril*, as I ſaid; where *Clemens* had indeed occaſion to diſpute the Queſtion of *Antiquity* between the *Heathen* and the *Sacred* Writers, there he has not the leaſt intimation of either of them; and the very words quoted by St. *Cyril* are exactly in *Euſebius*, but not as out of the Text of *Sanchoniathon*, but the *Preface* of *Philo Byblius*. Which he could not ſo eaſily have confounded if he had uſed the Book himſelf; but might very probably in borrowing them from *Euſebius*, who compriſes all he or *Porphyry* had collected both out of the *Text* and the *Preface*, in the ſame Chapters immediately following each other. Beſides *Porphyry* reckons but eight Books of *Sanchoniathon de Abſt.* II. 56. but *Euſebius* Nine, reckoning it ſeems the very Preface of *Philo* for a diſtinct Book. Which being quoted as *Sanchoniathon*'s by *Cyril*, ſhews that he follows the very diviſion of *Euſebius*, and therefore took what he had from him.

Strom. I.

Pr. Ev. I. 9.

Bochart conceives the *Phyſiology* or *Theogony* to have been a diſtinct Book from the Hiſtory. But ſee what is ſaid hereafter.

§. VI. BUT what is it he pretends to tell from *Clemens Alexandrinus*? That

Sanchoniathon's Book was Tranſlated by *Joſephus*. But who ever mentions ſuch a *Tranſlation* amongſt the Works of *Joſephus*? How is it credible that he ſhould ſo far favour the cauſe of the *Phœnicians* who ſo profeſſedly maintains the greater *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* againſt them in his Books againſt *Appion*? And who can reconcile this pretended Teſtimony from *Clemens* with *Porphyry*, who certainly, if any, converſed with the Original Tranſlation? If he be to be credited, here are again two great miſtakes of St. *Cyril*, Firſt his miſtaking *Philo Byblius* for the famous *Alexandrian Philo* the *Jew*; then his confounding that *Philo* with *Joſephus* who was of the ſame Nation. Which again plainly ſhew, that he quoted him by *memory*, and at the *Second hand*.

§. VII. BUT beſides that this *ſilence*, or *Second hand* Quotations, even *after* the time he was divulged and applauded by *Porphyry*, are ſtrong ſuſpicions that he was either not known, or not regarded (either of which are equally ſerviceable to my purpoſe;) yet further, what ſhould be the reaſon that ſo uſeful and Antient an Author ſhould be ſo little known even *before* the time of *Porphyry*? Was it becauſe he was locked up in the *Phœnician*

Tongue

Tongue? But why ſhould he not at leaſt, have been better known after the *Greek* Tranſlation of him by *Philo Byblius*? Yet even then ſo little was he known that, were it not for the forementioned Teſtimony of *Athenæus*, we might juſtly doubt whether ſuch a Tranſlation was ever undertaken by that *Philo*. *Suidas* mentions this *Philo*, and reckons up others of his Works, and fixes his time. He places him near the Reign of *Nero*, and makes him Threeſcore and Eighteen Years old, at the Conſulſhip of *Severus Herennius* in *Olymp.* 220. Which if it be true muſt fall at leaſt about the Reign of *Trajan*, though no ſuch Conſulſhip appear in our preſent *Faſti*, poſſibly becauſe he might have been either a *Suffectus*, or expunged out of the publick *Faſti* for ſome Crime. Nay, he expreſly makes him to have written concerning the Reign of *Hadrian*. And therefore, in all likelyhood the broken number of the odd *Olympiads* above Two Hundred and Twenty is wanting in *Suidas*. But what ground *Scaliger* had to fix the Year of the 229. *Olymp.* I do not underſtand. Yet no ſuch Tranſlation appears in that Catalogue of his Works, unleſs it were contained under the Ἄλλα. *Voce* Φίλων. *Scaliger*, in ὀλυμπάδ. συναγωγ.

§. VIII. AND why ſhould he never have been mentioned by thoſe antient *Apologiſts* for the *Chriſtian* Religion who wrote before *Porphyry*? They had a juſt occaſion for it in that great Diſpute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* above all *Heathen* Authors. On this occaſion they drew up Catalogues of the Antienteſt *Heathen* Authors they knew of, yet *Sanchoniathon*, the moſt appoſite Inſtance of them all, never being ſo much as thought of. Not by *Juſtin Martyr* in the time of *Antoninus Pius*, though he was a *Samaritan*, and had thereby the opportunity to have known the famous Writers of his Neighbouring *Phœnicians*, nay to have underſtood them though they had not been Tranſlated to his hand. Yet he knew of nothing *Antient* either amongſt the *Greeks* or the *Barbarians*. Which how could he have ſaid if he had known any thing of this moſt Antient *Sanchoniathon*? Not by *Theophilus Antiochenus* in the time of *Verus*, with whom he ends his Chronology, though he were nearer the *Phœnicians* than the *Græcians*, nay and had ſpecial occaſion in mentioning the *Phœnician* Antiquities. Not by *Tatianus* the Scholar of St. *Juſtin*, and ſo not long, if at all, after him, when he wrote his *Oration*

Οὐδ' ἐστὶ τί σύγγραμμα παλαιὸν, Ἑλλήνων ἢ Βαρβάρων σημαῖνον πρᾶξιν. *Juſt.* Mart. Paræn. p. 13. Ad Autolyc. L. III.

tion against the *Greeks* (it does not appear that St. *Justin* was then dead, though I know how *Tatianus* is mistaken by *Eusebius*, who has also generally deceived the Learned who have followed him) though he was an *Assyrian*, and takes particular notice of the Antientest *Græcian* and *Phœnician* Authors, and names all the most Antient *Phœnicians* that he knew of, which were but Three, *Theodotus*, *Mochus* and *Hypsicrates*. Not by *Clemens* as has already been observed, who deduces his computation to the death of *Commodus*, though he also had occasion, in disputing that same Controversie concerning the Age of the most Antient Heathen Writers. I think St. *Cyril*'s mistake concerning him, has been sufficiently discovered and convicted. Not by *Tertullian* in the times of *Severus* and *Caracalla*, though he had also the like occasion given him in his *Apology*. Not by *Origen*, though he refers to *Josephus* against *Appion*, and *Tatianus* for a Collection of such *Phœnician* Authors as had mentioned any thing concerning Jewish Affairs; nay mentions *Herennius Philo* who had written concerning the

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. IV. 16. He only says that *Crescens* had endeavoured the death of St. *Justin* (πραγματευθῆς is his Word) but he has not the least intimation that it was in his power to accomplish it. What he says was only taken from *Justins* own words in his *Apology*.

Or. adv. Græc. p. 171. & ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. X. 2. p. 493.

Strom. I.

Apolog. c. 19.

C. *Cels.* lib. I. p. 13, 14.

Jews, if this be the *Philo* to whom the Tranſlation of *Sanchoniathon* is aſcribed by *Porphyry*, as in all likelyhood he is the *Philo* mentioned by *Suidas*, who had ſaid of himſelf that his Sir-name was *Herennius*. And the Title of *Herennius Philo* is given him in the Inſcription of a *M. S.* Work of his on *Ariſtotles Metaphyſicks*, now in the Library of the moſt accompliſhed and truly Great Dr. *Iſaac Voſſius*. And my very Dear and very Learned Friend Dr. *Lloyd* conceives that he might have borrowed that Sir-name of *Herennius* from his Patron *Herennius Severus* the Conſul, which was uſually for *Liberti* to * do in thoſe times; and that the Conſul was the ſame with him mentioned in *Pliny*, *Ep. Lib.* iv. 28. who there appears to have been a Lover of Learning, and himſelf a very Learned Perſon. The Times do very well agree; and it is not otherwiſe eaſie to conceive how *Philo* a *Phœnician* ſhould come by a *Roman* Name. And that he was very intimate with that Conſul appears both by his dating his own Age by hi

*When they were made *Liberti* they were not only made *Romans*, but taken into the *Families* of their *Patrons*, as appears from the *Inſcriptions* of their *Family Sepulchres*, which were generally conceived in that Form, *FILIIS ET FILIABUS, LIBERTIS ET LIBERTABUS POSTERISQUE EORUM*. And then how proper was it for them to receive the *Gentile* name of their *Patrons Family*?

his *Patrons Conſulſhip* and by his bringing *Hermippus* his Country-man and Scholar acquainted with him. Yet even on this occaſion, *Origen* makes no mention of his *Sanchoniathon* among thoſe *Phœnician* Writers which he immediately refers to as mentioning *Jewiſh* Affairs. How could he have ſlipt ſuch an opportunity as this was, of mentioning him, if he had known him? Not even by *Celſus* himſelf, whom *Origen* places under *Hadrian*, though he muſt certainly have lived later if he be the ſame to whom *Lucian* dedicated his *Pſeudomantis* after the death of *Marcus Antoninus* whom he calls Θεὸς, nay muſt have written this very Work againſt the *Chriſtians* later than *Hadrian*, for (1) *Marcellina* and (2) *Marcion*, both of them mentioned by him, as they firſt broached their *Hereſies* under *Anicetus*, ſo moſt probably after the death of *Hadrian*. *Philo* was as his work mentioned by *Origen* ſhews him, ſufficiently diſaffected to the *Jews*, ſo that if he did Tranſlate any ſuch work of *Sanchoniathon*, he would moſt probably have deſigned it as *Porphyry*, to confront the Antiquity of the *Jews*. And how greedily would *Celſus* have ſeconded him if he had known of any ſuch work Publiſhed by him? Thus it appears that this

See *Suid.* in Ἑρμιππ.

(1) ap. *Orig.* L. v. p. 272
(2) ap. *Orig.* L. vi. p. 326. & ubi ſuprà.

this *Sanchoniathon* was either generally not known, or (which amounts to the ſame thing) generally neglected by all ſorts of Authors, both *Chriſtians* and *Heathens* too, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*.

§. IX. BUT to aſcend yet higher, what ſhould hinder him from being known even before *Philo Byblius*, if he had been what he is pretended? It is true, he could neither have been known nor deſervedly valued by the *Greeks* till he was Tranſlated. But what imaginable cauſe is there why he was not Tranſlated more Antiently? The *Phœnician Records*, and *Hiſtories* had been ſearched and tranſlated and divulged by *Hieronymus Tyrius*, *Menander Epheſius* and *Dius*, *Heſtiæus* and *Philoſtratus* and others; nay the very Original Records themſelves are quoted by *Joſephus*, and the Original Copies of the Epiſtles between *Solomon* and *Hiram* are ſtill mentioned as extant in their *Archives* by the ſame *Joſephus* and *Theophilus Antiochenus*. How come it to paſs they ſhould all of them overlook this moſt conſiderable, moſt creditable Author? Why ſhould they omit this moſt Antient account of their moſt Antient Times, when the great deſign of all theſe Enquiries ſeems to have been

Vid. *Bochart.* Chanaan L. II. c. 17. *Joſeph.* Ant. viii. 2. c. *Appion.* L. I.

Theoph. Ant. L. III. ad *Autolyc.*

been a General Diſpute concerning the moſt Antient Nations? Why did they not Tranſlate him then? Why did they not, at leaſt, take out of him, and vouch him for their Authority? Had they done ſo, why ſhould not *Joſephus* have had recourſe to him, if not in his *Phœnician* Original, yet at leaſt as to thoſe particulars they had borrowed from him? Why does he never mention him either in his *Antiquities*, or his Books againſt *Appion*, eſpecially in thoſe things which he relates concerning *Abraham*, which he was particularly careful to confirm by the beſt Teſtimonies he knew of. Ant. l. 8.

§. X. *Sanchoniathon* had been uſeful even to thoſe who had enquired only for their *Hiſtories*. But conſider we him further as a *Philoſopher*; for ſuch the Writers of the Θεογονίαι and eſpecially of the Κοσμογονίαι whereof much of *Sanchoniathon*'s Work conſiſted, were then reputed, that being the uſual *Myſtical* way whereby they concealed the ſecrets of their *Natural Philoſophy*. So alſo *Suidas* Σαγχωνιάθων. Τύριος Φιλόσοφος. Indeed the Θεολογία ſeems to have been the ſame with the Κοσμογονία. For what *Euſebius* had called the Θεολογία of the *Phœnicians Pr. Ev. l.* 9. that he calls their Κοσμογονία *c.* 10. To which he adds the

Ζωογονία

Ζωογονία also for compleating it. For both these were pretended to be taken from the Κοσμογονία of *Taautus*. Yet even so, there were several fair occasions of discovering, and Translating him, Antienter than *Philo*. For their Antienteſt *Philoſophers* had been also enquired into long before *Philo*. What was *Pythagoras*'s design in Travelling amongſt them? Was it only to see their Countries and their Fashions? Was it not rather to acquaint himself with their *Philoſophical* Improvements? And would he, who is so much celebrated for his Converſation with the *Phœnician Prophets*, the Posterity of *Mochus*, not rather have employed his time in inquiring after this equally, if not more, Antient both *Hiſtorian* and *Philoſopher Sanchoniathon*? After the *Macedonian* Conqueſts had opened an acceſs for the *Greek Philoſophers* to the *Phœnician Archives*; they then Translated as many as were valued by them. *Theodotus* and *Hypſicrates* and *Mochus* were Translated by *Aſitus* or *Chætus* as *Tatianus* tells us; and the same concerning *Mochus* and many others appear from *Strabo*. How comes *Sanchoniathon*, if there had then been any such Author extant, to have escaped their diligence?

Iamblich. de vita *Pythag.*

Orat. adv. *Græc. Cheetus.* But *Aſitus* is a fragment of the Oration, as quoted by *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. X. 11. But *Bochart* corrects it *Latus*, and rightly *Geogr. Lib.* XVI.

§. XI. He

§. XI. HE pretends to have had his Information from the Writings of *Taautus*, from the *Myſtical* Books of the *Ammonians*, and the Ὑπομνήματα or *Memoires* of *Jerombaal* the *Prieſt* of the God *Jevo*, the Ὑπομνήματα of the *particular Cities* and the Ἀναγραφαὶ of their *Temples*. Things very conſiderable indeed, if they had been truly pretended to. But let us ſee whether there be any reaſon to believe them on his credit. It was indeed a very Antient way of preſerving knowledge to inſcribe what they would preſerve in *Pillars* to be kept in the *Temples* of their moſt Eminent Gods, the better to be ſecured from *Weather* and the *Violence* of Prophane hands. Thus they did with their *Laws*, with their *Leagues* and *Covenants*, with their *Hiſtories*, and their *Arts* and *Sciences*. Inſtances might have been given of all theſe ſorts, if I had thought it neceſſary. Particularly, for *Hiſtories* there was that of *Euemerus* from the *Inſcriptions* in the *Temple* of *Jupiter Triphylius*; for *Arts*, thoſe from whence *Calliſthenes* gave *Ariſtotle* an account of the *Eclipſes* obſerved by the *Chaldæans*, thoſe of the ſame *Babylonians* referred to by *Epigenes*, *Beroſus* and *Critodemus*, and the Famous

Vid. *Plutarch* de Iſid. & Oſirid. *Lactant.* Div. Inſt. L. 11.
Ap. *Simpl.* in *Ariſt.* de Cælo. L. 11. Com. 16.
Plin. Nat. Hiſt. vii. 56.

ous *Pillars* of *Seth* mentioned by *Joſephus*. Out of ſuch *Pillars* as theſe no doubt the Publiſher of *Sanchoniathon* would have us believe his Hiſtory to have been gathered. Nor was it unuſual for *Deceivers* to impoſe on the World on the credit of ſuch *Pillars*. *Euemerus* now mentioned was looked on by Antiquity as a Famous inſtance of it. For it was certainly the eaſieſt way for broaching Falſe-hoods. Theſe were *Monuments* which could be produced on the *ſudden* concerning the moſt *remote* Antiquities without the atteſtation of Antient *Writings*, becauſe themſelves were ſuppoſed to be *Originals* of the times they pretended to give account of; were ſuppoſed remote from Vulgar *Knowledge* or *underſtanding*, being either kept in the *Adyta*, or locked up in ſome abſolute unknown *Character*, which none but the *Learned* and the *Prieſts* could underſtand; were contrived in *Hieroglyphicks* or ſuch *ambiguous* notes as were capable of what *Interpretation* thoſe deſigning Perſons who produced them were pleaſed to put upon them; depended generally on *Oral Tradition*, than which there is not a more unfaithful *Conveyer* of Monuments to *Poſterity*; depended wholly on the credit of the

Plutarch. de *Iſid.* & *Oſirid.* p. 360.

the *Priests*, being withal generally interested in the things thus preserved, making for the *credit* of their false *Religion*, or the *credit* of their *Nation*, for *Antiquity*, or rare *Inventions*; were to be found and examined only in *one place* (not like *Books* every where) nor even there it self without the Leave and Directions of such interessed *Priests*. Upon this account their very *humoured* Stories with which it was fashionable in those times to adorn their *Dialogues*, were grounded on the credit of such pretended *Inscriptions*. So *Cebes*'s *Table*, and the *Samothracian Inscriptions* referred to by *Axiochus*, and those concerning the *Atlantides* in *Timæus*.

§. XII. AND thus it was generally in the disingenuous dealings of those Nations, which upon the appearing of the *Jewish* Scriptures in the common Tongue, began to rival them, and one another for *Antiquity*. Thus the *Babylonians* in *Democritus* preserved their *Moral Discourses* in the *Pillars* of *Acicarus*. Thus *Xisuthrus* in *Berosus* is said to have preserved the *Chaldæan* Inventions Ingraven in *Plates* from the Deluge. Thus *Manetho* pretended to have gathered his new *Dynasties* from the like *Pillars* of *Mercury*. So *Cham* is pretended to have preserved his

Clem Alex. Strom. 1. p. 303.

Euseb. Gr. p. 6.

Cassian. Coll. viii. 21.

his inventions in *Judicial Aſtrology* by the like invention of Ingraving them in Plates, which Plates they uſually faſtned to *Pillars*; from whence I am apt to think that the *Gnoſticks* might take occaſion to forge that *Prophecy* which was among them obtruded in thoſe times under his Name. And as *Ægyptian* Notions were the Principal ingredient in moſt of thoſe Antient *Hereſies* that were comprehended under the common Name of *Gnoſticks*; ſo I am apt to think that *Chemi* the Antient Name of *Ægypt* gave them occaſion to father what they pleaſed on a Scripture-Patriarch of a Name that had ſome affinity to it, beſides that the *Scripture* it ſelf calls *Ægypt* ſo often the Land of *Ham*, ſo that the Inſcriptions of *Cham* and *Mercury* were probably the very ſame. The like I alſo conceive concerning the *Pillars* of *Seth* aforementioned from *Joſephus*. Nor is the miſtake ſo difficult as may be imagined. It is very well known that the *Dog-ſtar* was by the *Ægyptians* called (1) *Sothis*; That the revolution of their *great year* was accordingly from it called *Sothiaca* (2) *Periodus*, becauſe the *Dog-ſtar* then returned exactly to the very ſame place where he had been before; That their *great year* was therefore called

Clem. Alexandrin. Strom. VI. p. 642. A.

Plutarch. de *Iſid.* & *Oſirid.*

(1) *Horus Apoll.* c. 3. *Plutarch.* de *Iſid.* & *Oſi. Chalcidius, in Pla. Timæum* malè σολεχὴ. *Porphyr.* de antr. Nymphar.

(2) *Clem. Alexand.* Strom. I. p. 335. C.

κυνικὸς;

κυνικὸς or *Canicularis*, as *Cenſorinus* tells us, becauſe it began exactly on the firſt day of that Month on which the *Dog-ſtar* roſe, which was the *Ægyptian Thoth*. Who ſees not that the whole contrivance of that Year was exactly fitted to the courſe of that *Star*? And that therefore *Thoth* was reckoned for the firſt Month in the Year becauſe the *Dog-ſtar* roſe in it? If therefore its Name were given it with any deſign, it ſeems to have been therefore called *Thoth* becauſe their *Sothis* roſe in it, and therefore that thoſe two Names are indeed deſigned for the ſame. Nor is the change of *S* and *Th* either difficult or unuſual in thoſe Tongues, as might have been ſhewn by multitudes of Examples if I had leiſure. De die nat. c. 18.

§. XIII. BUT whether the Name of *Thoth* and *Sothis* were Originally the ſame or not; yet it ſeems clear that the Notions of *Mercury* were inſcribed to *Sothis*. So *Manetho*'s *Sacred Hiſtory* (in the ſame Senſe no doubt, that *Ennius*'s Tranſlation of *Euemerus*'s Hiſtory, pretended alſo from *Sacred Pillars* was alſo called *Sacred*) is called the βίβλος Σώθεως in *Euſeb. ib.* And, which yet comes more fully home to what I am now proving, the very Name Σὼθ is uſed in this matter Lactant. Div. Inſt. L. 1. c. 11.

from *Petosiris* an *Ægyptian* Writer, by *Vettius Valens*, *Antiochenus* in *Scaliger* and others, and that in the *Masculine Gender*. But this whole matter will be yet plainer if we remember that the design of *Manetho* (1) was to fit his *Chronology* to that *Sothiac Period*. We see it accordingly prevailed in most of the later *Ægyptian Chronologies*, which pretended to any more than ordinary *Exactness*. So the *Destruction* of *Troy* is noted in *Clem.* (2) *Alexandrinus*, most probably from an *Egyptian* Author. So were the years of *Nabonassar* in *Ptolomies Canon*, and the *Babylonian Eclipses* fitted to the same *Canicular year* by (3) *Hipparchus*. Now this *Sothiac Period* was purposely invented to give a full and exact account of the *Suns* course, till he was to rise exactly in the same place of the *Zodiac* where he had risen before. For proceeding on this *Hypothesis* that the true *Solar Year* consisted of 365 days and $\frac{1}{4}$, this Fourth was not intercalated every Fourth Year, as in the *Julian* account, but permitted to run on (purposely that their Festivities might pass through the whole Year) till those Fourth parts of a *Day* made up a whole *Year*, which they did in 1461. *Egyptian*, equivalent to 1460. *Julian* Years. That this was purposely designed

In loc *Eus.* Chr. Græc. p. 6.

(1) So *Concharis* is reckoned in the xvi. *Dynasty* τῶν Κυνικῶν λεγομένων Κύκλων ἀφ' οὗ τῶ Μανεθῶ. *Syncel.* p. 103. C.

(2) *Strom.* I.

(3) *Ptol.* L. iv. c. ult. p. 104.

designed to signifie the Course of the *Sun*, appears from their calling the whole Period by the Name of (*) *Annus* Ἡλιακὸς, and ὁ Θεοῦ ἐνιαυτὸς, as the Name of Θεὸς simply taken, signifies the *Sun* in *Antient Authors*. But the *Sun*, whose Course this was, was called *Typhon*, as *Typhon* was also called *Seth*, as *Plutarch* (*) assures us. Accordingly as most of the *Egyptian* Names of *Persons* and *Places* were taken from their *Gods*, so we have still footsteps of this *Gods* name in the *Names* of *Sethron*, *Sethos*, *Sethosis*, &c. And then it cannot be thought strange, that as his whole *Book* is denominated from his *Chronological Period*, so that *Period* it self should be ascribed to the *Egyptian Seth*, and consequently the *Pillars* also from which these accounts were taken. It may be another account may be given of this matter, that by the *Pillars* of *Seth* may be meant only their belonging to *Egypt*. So it appears that the same King who was called *Egyptus* by the *Greeks*, was by the *Egyptians* themselves

(*) *Censor.* ded. nat. c. 18.

(*) Οἱ δὲ τοῖς δὲ τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ τῶν ἀπ' Ἀστρολογίας Μαθηματικῶν ἔνια μιγνύντες Τυφῶνα μὲν ὅλον τὸν Ἡλιακὸν κόσμον. *Plutarch.* de *Isid.* & *Osirid.* p. 367. C. And a little after: Διὸ τὸν Τυφῶνα Σὴθ ἀεὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καλοῦσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καταδυναστεῦον ἢ καταβιαζόμενον. Where we have the *signification* of *Seth* in the *Egyptian Tongue*, and the reason why the *Sun* and *Typhon* were called so. Again, Τὸ Σὴθ αὐτὸν Τυφῶνα καλοῦσι φράζει μὲν τὸ καταδυναστεῦον καὶ καταβιαζόμενον. p. 371. B. Again ὁ δὲ Τυφῶν (ὥσπερ εἴρηται) Σὴθ. p. 376. A.

ſelves called *Sethos*, and as it ſeems from thence concluded by *Manetho* to have been the ſame with him whom the *Greeks* called *Ægyptus* the Brother of *Danaus*, (who neither was himſelf known to the *Ægyptians*, by the name of *Danaus* but *Armais*) becauſe *Sethos* in the *Ægyptian* Tongue, ſignified the ſame thing as *Ægyptus* in the *Greek*. Now the Name of *Egypt* was derived from the Name of *Ægyptus*, by which he was known to the *Greeks*, and therefore proportionably the Name of *Sethos* muſt have derived the like denomination of *Sethos* to his *Country*. So *Theophilus Antiochenus* from *Manetho*: Αἴγυπτος ὃ ἡ χώρα ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Σέθως τὸ γὰρ ΣΕΘΩΣ φασὶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΣ καλεῖσθαι. Which, being once admitted, will open a further way of expounding *Joſephus's* γῆ Ζυειάδι, which muſt be reconciled with the place where the *Mercurial Pillars* were placed by *Manetho*, and is by him called Σειριάδικὴ. And to derive this yet higher, the uſual occaſion theſe emulous Nations took for challenging the glorious *Actions* or *Perſons* of each others to themſelves, was when themſelves alſo had *Actions* or *Perſons* of the ſame *Name*. Now *Heliopolis* in *Egypt* was Famous for thoſe *Mercurial Writings*. And

Theoph. Antioch. L. III. ad Autolyc.

Ant. l. 3.

And therefore they who were ambitious of challenging them to themſelves, were to take occaſion of doing ſo from a *Heliopolis* of their own. Accordingly the *Chaldæans*, for their *Xiſuthrus* pitched on *Heliopolis* in *Sippara*, and the *Phœnicians* had their *Heliopolis* at Mount *Libanus*, a *Sacred* place, and particularly famous for their *Baitulia*. And when they had, on this pretence, claimed *Mercury* as their own, the change was very obvious, from Σπειραδικὴ to Συειραδικὴ, for them who were willing from thence to conclude, that theſe *Mercurial Pillars* were to be expected only in *Syria*, where their *Heliopolis* was placed. The very Analogy of *Grammar* is ſufficient to ſhew that it was a *willful* and *deſigned* variation. Συειρὰ had indeed been *Greek*, but ἡ Συειράδ, though in the Native Caſe, ſeems to have been a change from Συειραδικὴ, as that alſo from Σπειραδικὴ, on the deſign now mentioned. And there is ſtill a footſtep of Σπειραδικὴ as the Antienteſt Reading in *Joſephus*, that *Euſtathius* reads it Σπϊρειράδ, *Hexaem.* And this very Origination of this *Word* is a ſtrong Preſumption that Συειραδικὴ rather than Συειγγικὴ (as ſome Learned Perſons would have it from *Ammian*) is indeed an Antient Reading

Bochart. Chanaan L. 11. c. 2.

in *Josephus*. That I may not now mention the Antient *Translation* of *Josephus* by *Cassiodore*, and as many of the Antients as followed either *that* or the *Greek* near those times, who generally take it for *Syria* on the account now mentioned. I confess I cannot easily distrust *Ammian* in what he says concerning those *Syringes*, where those *Sacred Hieroglyphical* Inscriptions were, which were designed to be preserved from a *deluge*, because he pretends to write *visa pleraque*, what he had seen with his own Eyes. I confess I am apt to think that these *Syringes*, were the places designed for the so much celebrated *Pillars* of *Mercury*, though these Inscriptions were in *Vaults under ground* (those were properly *Syringes*) and in *Walls* rather than *Pillars* (though I know how largely the Notion of σήλαι may be understood) because I cannot think they had them in two places, for that same reason of preserving them from the *Deluge*. Yet the Country where they were, might have been called *Seriadica*, and that it was so, we have, before *Josephus*, the more Antient Testimony of *Manetho*. Besides it is considerable, that the Doctrine of the two Destructions of the World, one by *Fire*, another by *Water*, which is pretended

Ammian Marcellin. l. 22. *Val-s.* in loc. Sir *John Marsham.* Chro. Can. Sec. 1. p. 39. Ed. *Lipsi.*

Ib. p. 413.

tended as the occaſion of erecting theſe two *Pillars*, is originally *Ægyptian*. And they, no doubt on pretence of ſuch *Pillars*, boaſted themſelves alone to have preſerved their *Hiſtories*, through the ſeveral *Deluges* and *Conflagrations*. And from this confounding the *Babylonian* and *Ægyptian* accounts, which followed upon their ſeveral reſpective *Emulations*, I ſuppoſe it was, that theſe Inventers of the Fable of *Seth*, were ſo particular in telling us the very *materials* of thoſe *Pillars*. The *Ægyptian Syringes* were, as it appears from *Ammian* cut out of a *Quarrey*, and therefore were of ſolid ſtone. But the *Babylonian* mentioned by *Epigenes* were *Coctilibus Laterculis*, for which that place was Famous. Theſe two ſo well fitting the deſign of preſerving them from the *Conflagration* and the *Deluge*, made them, who were willing to confound things for Intereſts of their own, to be as I ſaid ſo very particular, not conſidering that by the account given in *Plato*'s *Timæus*, the *Ægyptians* had another pretence of preſerving their own *Inſcriptions* from the *Conflagration* as well as from the *Deluge*.

Vid. *Pluton* in *Tim.* qui ea habuit ab *Ægyptiis*.

Ammian, L. xxiii.

Ap. *Plin.* N. H. vii. 56.

§. XIV. SO alſo, for the *Writings* from whence our *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have collected his Hiſtory, there ſeems

little doubt but they were alſo deſigned for the ſame with thoſe of *Mercury*; as alſo that the Subject of theſe *Writings*, were taken from thoſe *Plates* and *Pillars* now mentioned. *Philo Byblius* himſelf expreſly ſays, that *Sanchoniathon* enquired very carefully into the Notions of *Taautus*; That *Taautus*, to whom they were aſcribed, was no other than (*) *Mercury*, will, I believe, need no proof. And theſe *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians* being joyned with them, makes it yet more probable. For even among our preſent Counterfeits under the Name of *Mercury*, we have an Epiſtle of *Aſclepius* to *Ammon*, concerning the Concealment of their *Philoſophical Myſteries*, with ſeveral other Fragments of the like addreſs in *Stobæus Eclog. Phyſ.* by which we ſee that thoſe unfaithful dealers with *Hermes*, did both joyn this *Ammon* with him whom they make a King in *Libya* (very probably with ſome relation to the Famous *Libyan* Oracle of *Jupiter Ammon*) and withal, made the ſame *Ammon* a very zealous Patron of thoſe *Philoſophical Myſteries*. So that this holds exact correſpondence with thoſe other Cheats, and looks as if it belonged to the ſame Forge. Unleſs poſſibly we may refer it to that more

(*) *Philo Byblius* ſays ſo expreſly in *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. A.

more Antient Conjunction of *Thoth* and *Thomuz*, and the God of the *Ægyptian Thebes*, called *Ammon* in *Plato* himſelf, whence it comes to paſs that the *Ægyptian Thebes* has, in the Prophets, the Name of *No-Ammon*, as it was uſual, and, as *Diodorus* obſerves moſt proper to the *Ægyptians*, to denominate their *Cities* from their *Deities*. It may be this may be the reaſon why the Name of *Ammon* is ſo uſually made uſe of in the accounts of the *Ægyptian Philoſophy*, becauſe the Name it ſelf ſeems an off ſpring of *Ham*, aſcribed in the Scripture to the Land of *Ægypt* it ſelf, ſo that the *Ammonian Philoſophy* is no more than a *Colony* of the *Ægyptian*. And theſe Ἀπόῤῥητα γεγράμματα, theſe *Myſtical Writings* were moſt properly aſcribed to this God, whoſe very *Name*, as *Manetho* expounds it, ſignified in the *Ægyptian Tongue*, τὸ κεκρυμμένον καὶ ἀφανές. How much more proper an *Etymology* is this, than that which *Bochart* gives elſewhere from the *Hebrew*, where his Intereſt for *Sanchoniathon*, obliges him to make theſe *Ammonian Writings Phœnician*?

In *Phædr.* p. 213.

Ap. *Plutarch.* de Iſ. & Oſirid.

De *Phœn.* Col. 11. 17.

§. XV. But to examine now the Credibility of his pretence to theſe Means; it is firſt conſiderable that, ſeeing theſe *Records* were *Ægyptians*, it is not eaſie to explain

plain how *Sanchoniathon* himſelf, a Man of another Nation, could have acceſs to them. The difficulty *Pythagoras* found notwithſtanding the powerful recommendation of *Polycrates* to *Amaſis* who was his *Hoſpes*, ſhews how averſe they were to communicate their *Myſteries* to *Foreigners*. But it was not at all to be expected by Perſons *uncircumciſed*, as the *Phœnicians* were undoubtedly in the pretended Age of *Sanchoniathon*. But ſuppoſing he had Conquered the difficulties of acceſs, and ſubmitted, as *Pythagoras* ſeems to have done, to Circumciſion; yet the *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians*, and much more the *Myſtical Hieroglyphicks* of the *Ægyptians* (of which kind the Sacred *Inſcriptions* of their *Pillars* generally were) depended ſtill on a higher degree of *good will* and *fidelity* of the *Prieſts* for their *Explication*. And who can undertake that they would, after all, deal *Faithfully* with him? Eſpecially if they had ſuſpected the leaſt deſign in him of committing them to *Writing*, and *divulging* them to Poſterity? And after all, what judicious Perſon would not rather enquire for this Information *Originally* from the *Ægyptians* themſelves? Who would not rather have truſted *their preſent*

Porphyr. de vit. *Pythag.* p. 183. vid. Not. *Holſten.*

ſenſe

ſenſe in which they were agreed, even in *later* times, than ſuch *Second-hand* Relations concerning the ſenſe of their *Anceſtors*? And then, what will become of this ſo much applauded Teſtimony of *Sanchoniathon*, if *Phœnician* matters muſt not be expected from him, as they could not from ſuch means of Information; and if the Teſtimony even of the *later Ægyptians* muſt be preferred before him? I am very well aware that the whole credit of this Author depends on the contrary ſuppoſition, that both theſe *Pillars* of *Taautus*, and *Apocryphal Books* of the *Ammonians*, were in *Phœnicia*, and concerned *Phœnician* Affairs, and in the *Phœnician* Tongue or *Characters*, that a Native *Phœnician* might be preſumed fitteſt to underſtand them.

§. XVI. THIS will indeed, and will alone, make him ſo *credible* as he is thought to be. And it is plainly ſuppoſed in the Author himſelf, who makes *Hermes* a Native *Phœnician*, and to be made *King* of *Ægypt* by one that was. And this ſeems the moſt likely account how the *Pillars* of *Seth* (which I ſaid ſeem to be the ſame with thoſe of *Mercury*) came to be placed by *Joſephus* in *Syria*, that he had met them placed there by

Apud Euſ. Pr. Ev. 1. 10. p. 36. A. 39. B.

by ſome who were thus in Intereſt, concerned to place them ſo, to juſtifie their other Factions. Beſides τῇ Σηθιδικῇ in *Manetho* was eaſily corrupted into Σεθιδικῇ in *Joſephus*, by them who were willing to have it ſo, as has already been obſerved. And the *Ægyptian* Name of *Seth*, ſo exactly agreeing with the *Hebrew* Name, was a likely *occaſion* of miſtake, and an *Argument* too, for them who had rather have him believed to be a *Hebrew* than an *Ægyptian*. But then againſt this I oppoſe all the contrary, both *Teſtimonies* and *Arguments* that might be produced to prove that *Hermes* was a Native *Ægyptian*, and that *Ægypt* was never ſo ſubdued by the *Phœnicians* as to receive, nor *Phœnicia* in ſuch a ſtrong and flouriſhing condition, as to give them a *King* of their own Nation. That is as many Teſtimonies, as there are or have been *Ægyptian* Writers, not only *after*, but *before* the publiſhing of this pretended *Sanchoniathon*; as many of them, at leaſt, as mention ſuch a Perſon as *Hermes*, as many of them as wrote before theſe Diſputes of Antiquity of Nations were ſtarted, as well as they who wrote afterwards, to abet parties now made, and to drive on deſigns by this time already formed to their hand.

nd. The higheſt account of all the *Mercuries* in *Cicero*'s time, that was given them who had then the curioſity to quire into the *Gods* of the *ſame Name*, ounted not to above five, and among em no mention of any one that was a *henician*, a ſign none ſuch was ſo much challenged by them, till this pretended *nchoniathon*. The ſame account is followed by others afterwards, by *Ampelius* d *Arnobius*, a ſign that even *then* this titious *Phœnician* was not of that credit, to be thought worthy to encreaſe the ceived Number. And theſe were ſufficient to be oppoſed to the true *Sanchoniathon* himſelf. The Original Writings of *Taautus*, and the *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians* muſt have been theirs, and ould have been Interpreted by none but hem, if we will allow any thing to the oncurrent Teſtimonies of *diſintereſſed* Antiquity. But how much more than ſufficient are they to over-ſway the *Vouchers* or *him*, and for all thoſe *things* alſo which ecommend him as ſo very creditable? How much Antienter? How much freer rom deſign? That I may not now deſcend to Perſonal Compariſons.

De Nat. Deor. L. III.

Arnob. adv. Gent. L. iv.

§. XVII. BUT (poſſibly to avoid the difficulty to be ſuppoſed in underſtanding

Writings

Writings of this Nature;) it is ſuppoſe
that *Taautus* either *found* or *made* all thing
clear; that he Originally wrote them
whatever he wrote upon his own know
ledge; that he *made* them ſo, where h
did not, as in his diſcovery of theſe *Myſt*
Sanchon. apud *Euſ.* Pr.Ev.l. 9. p. 32. B. *cal Books* of the *Ammonians*, from ſom
Monuments of their own, concealed i
their *Adyta*, and of difficult acceſs, bu
yet procured and divulged by him; tha
he unriddled the Tales and *Allegories*
wherein they had been Originally con
cealed. But that the later *Prieſts* again
retrived their *Mythologies* and Arts o
concealment. That as for the *Mercuria*
Ap. *Euſ.* ib.p.39.C. Books themſelves the Son of *Thabion* wa
the firſt who turned them into *Allegory*
from whom they came to the *Greeks*
Ib.p.40.B. That many Generations afterwards *Sur*
mubelus, the *God* (I ſuppoſe ſo Sir-named
like *Antiochus*, and *Diodorus Cronu*
the *Philoſopher*, from *Saturn*, and *Pio*
the *Egyptian* from *Apollo*, that I may in-
ſtance alſo in *private Perſons* who were
Sir-named from *Gods*, not only *denomi-*
natively,) and *Thuro* a Woman Sir-named
Chuſarthis, explained thoſe *Allegories*.
That by this means they might come clear
to *Sanchoniathon* from *Writings*, without
Perſonal Diſcoveries of the *Prieſts*, which

was

as not to be expected. This ſeems con-
ived, as if it were on purpoſe to defend
e Credit of theſe Informations.

§. XVIII. BUT how many things are
re ſuppoſed no way conſiſtent with the
otions of thoſe times? We ſee it is ac-
owledged that the Arts of *concealment*
Myſteries, had been taken up and uſed
fore, becauſe *Taautus* is ſaid to have un-
ddled thoſe of the *Ammonians*. And
ho know not how great a *Piaculum* it
as thought to *divulge Myſteries*? How
rticularly Superſtitious the *Antients*
re that way, as appears from the Fa-
s of *Phineus* and *Prometheus*? And
oncerning the *Ægyptians*) from their
orſhip of *Harpocrates*? How it was Ca-
al for the Perſon who endeavoured it,
d how they would no doubt have *ſup-*
ſſed ſuch Publications of their *Myſteries*
lay in their power to do ſo? How
n could *Sanchoniathon* come by them
o lived ſo many Ages after? Was
becauſe they *could not* ſuppreſs all Copies
what had once eſcaped them at *firſt*,
ecially not ſuch as were in the Hands of
Phœnicians, who were not obnoxious
their Juriſdiction? But would they, at
ſt, have paid that *Honour* to the Me-
ry of a Perſon guilty of a Crime then
reputed

reputed ſo very *impious* as to make him a *God*? Would they not rather have erected *Pillars* to his diſgrace (from whence came afterwards the popular notion of σηλιτεύειν) than borrowed all their *Sacred Rites* and *Inventions* from his *Books* or *Pillars*? Would they have aſcribed all their *Solemnities* of *Religion* (as it appears they did from *Clemens Alexandrinus*) to ſuch a *Prophaner* of their *Secrets*, to ſo impious a violator of their received Religion?

Strom. vi.

§. XIX. AND who indeed was more unlikely to have ſuch an accuſation laid to his charge, than he that was reputed the Firſt Inſtitutor of their *Religion*, the firſt Impoſer of that Sacred *ſilence* which they took for ſo neceſſary a Duty of all that would pretend to be *Religious*? Why ſhould they aſcribe their *Hieroglyphicks* and their *Sacred Characters* to him, if they had not thought that he had invented them purpoſely for this concealment? But conſider him even as the Inventor only of their *Letters* (an Invention expreſly aſcribed to him by this pretended *Sanchoniathon* himſelf) and they cannot ſhew it poſſible for him to make that diſcovery he is pretended to have made from the very *Writings* of the *Ammonians*. For all

Sacrarum literarum peritos facit. Jul. Firmic. Matheſ. Lib. III. c. 8.

Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 36. A.

other

other *Sacred* ways but *Letters*, were of ſo æquivocal ſignification, as nothing could be gathered from them without the *Oral Traditions* of their *Prieſts*. And therefore he could not have made ſo great Diſcoveries by *Books*, if himſelf were the firſt Inventor of *Letters*.

§. XX. BUT who is this Son of *Thabion*, who is ſaid to have turned them back into *Allegories*, and from whom they came at laſt to the *Greeks*? I ſuppoſe *Agathodæmon*, or the Second *Mercury* the Father of *Tat*, who is ſaid by *Manetho* to have tranſlated the Books of the ſaid *Elder Mercury* into *Greek*, but yet Τεθμμασιν ἱερογλυφικοῖς, that is in the *Sacred Ægyptian Letter*, contradiſtinct from that which was of common uſe, poſſibly that though the *words* were, yet the *Characters* might not be underſtood by the *Greeks* without the *Prieſts* aſſiſtance, which he alſo ſecured by placing them in the *Adyta*. All theſe things ſeem exactly to agree with the preſent Fragments of the *Mercurial* Writings in *Greek*, where the *Elder Mercury* is blamed by *Ammon* for divulging their *Myſteries*; where the *Second Mercury* is he who generally ſpeaks in his *own* Perſon, the *Elder* is ſpoken of in the *Third*, and *Tat* is mentioned as his *Son*, and the Μυσέων ἀπεκεκρυμμένων is ſo often

Ap. *Euſeb.* G. p. 6. Ed. *Scaliger.*

ten mentioned, where the very *Pillars* are mentioned, and that they were to be *divulged* to Posterity from those *Pillars*, as appears from a Fragment of them extant in *Stobæus*. Yet it does not appear that *Manetho* published that Text of those *Mercurial Books* he pretends to have used out of the *Sacred Ægyptian*, into the common *Greek* Character. That he might forbear to do as a *Priest*. Possibly *Numenius* might have contributed hereunto, who is therefore charged by his own *Heathen* Brethren for divulging *Mysteries*. Whoever did so, seems also to have enlarged those of *Manetho*, with other things he took for *Mercurial*, as will appear hereafter. However these very allusions to these *Greek Mercurials*, are sufficient to convict this pretended *Sanchoniathon* of *falsehood*, in the opinion of such as believe the *Mercurials* themselves to be *Forgeries*, and Forgeries much later than the time that *Sanchoniathon* pretends to. However, if they were again involved by this Second *Hermes*, how comes *Sanchoniathon* to have understood them? But if this *Surmubelus* and *Thuro* had extricated them before the time of *Sanchoniathon*, how comes *Orpheus* (who must have been *Elder* or contemporary with him, if he flourished at, or a little before, the War of *Troy*, and

Stob. Eclog. Phys.

Macrob. in somn. Scipon. L. 1. c. 2.

and who is generally ſuppoſed to have borrowed his Notions from the *Ægyptians*) not to have underſtood them free from *Allegories*, as well as this pretended *Sanchoniathon*? But to proceed.

§. XXI. HE is pretended alſo to have borrowed his Informations from *Hierombaal* the *Prieſt* of the God *Jevo*. There is little reaſon to doubt but that he meant *Gideon*, who was by his Father *Joaſh* Sir-named *Jerubbaal*. The putting of *H* before *Hebrew* Words beginning with *I* (that is, putting *Aſpirations* where in the Original, the *J* is Conſonant) is ſo common, that I believe none will doubt of it. Inſtances are very obvious, as in *Hieremias*, *Hieruſalem*, *Hiericho*, *&c.* And the MS. *Greek* μ is as eaſie to have been miſtaken for a *u*, which is their Mark for *i* which is an ordinary occaſion of miſtake in multitudes of MSS. Eſpecially in the leſs skillful *Publiſhers* of Printed Books from MSS. and this Name is at this preſent Written *Jerobaal*, with an *o* in the Vulgar *Latin* Text, *Judg.* vi. 32. And almoſt as little reaſon is there to doubt, but that the Name *Jevo*, is only a *Greek* imitation of the *Tetagrammaton*, the middle and final *Aſpirations* being utterly unexpreſſible in the *Greek* Tongue. But

Jud. vi. 32.

neither is this account of his Information, any thing more creditable than the others. How could *Gideon* be a *Prieſt*, who was of the Tribe of *Manaſſeh*? Was it on account of the *Ephod* which *Gideon* made? But where is there the leaſt intimation that he wrote it himſelf? Nay, when he is ſaid to have placed it in his own City of *Ephra*, it ſeems to imply, that it was placed there for another's wearing. And how comes it to paſs, that the Scripture ſhould paſs it over in ſilence, that is ſo punctual in taking notice of Violations of the *Prieſthood*, in matters of leſſer conſequence in *Jeroboam* and others? But how could *Sanchoniathon* have been guilty of ſuch a miſtake, in ſo freſh a memory of *Gideon*, in ſo near a Neighbourhood of the *Jews*, in a matter wherein then the meaneſt of them could have informed him (ſo careful they were then to keep up the memory of their *Tribes*) if he had been ſo diligent in procuring Information, as he pretended? Suppoſe he had been ſo negligent himſelf; yet, how could King *Abibalus*, to whom he is ſaid to have *Dedicated* his Book? How could all his *contemporary Enquirers after Truth*, from all whom, he is pretended to have received commendations, be yet all ſo miſtaken

Jud. viii. 27.

Οἱ καθ' αὐτὸν ἐξετασταὶ τῆς ἀληθείας

Verba Porphyrii ap. Euſeb. Pr. Ev. l. 9 31. A.

taken in a thing of so easie Information? Yet to make this fancy concerning *Gideon's Priesthood* look more likely, the excellent *Bochart* conceives that the *Baal Berith*, with whom the *Israelites* committed *Idolatry* after the death of *Gideon*, must have been the God of *Berytus*, *Sanchoniathon's* own City. But it seems most likely, that this *Baal Berith* was the *God* (not the *Goddess*) to whom *Gideon's Ephod* was Consecrated, at his own City *Ophra*. That *Ephod* is said to have been a *snare* to *Him* and his *Family*. And accordingly this *Baal Berith's* Temple, furnished the *Sichemites* with Arms in their Conspiracy with *Abimelech*, which proved the ruin of the greatest part of *Gideon's* Family. If so, then there was no ground to make this *Baal Berith* the same with *Jao*, to whom *Philo Byblius* would have us believe that *Gideon* was *Priest*. However, there is no probability that *Berith* (if it must needs be the name of a *place*) could be the same with *Berytus*. This *Berith*; where the *Sichemites* dwelt was in all likelyhood under the Dominion of the *Israelites*, but *Berytus* was in *Phœnicia*, and was in *Sanchoniathon's* time (if we may believe *Philo Byblius*) under a distinct *King* from *Israel*. Besides the different

Ph. Col. 11. 17.
Judg. viii. 33.
Judg. viii. 27.
Judg. iv. 4.

ferent ways of writing these words in the *Hebrew*, gives little occasion for such a mistake. The *Phœnician Berytus* was so called as *Stephanus* tells us, rather from בארות διὰ τὸ ἔνυδρον. βὴρ γὰρ τὸ φρέαρ παρ' αὐτοῖς. And it is observable, that *Stephanus* seems to have taken what he had concerning these *Phœnician* places, from *Philo Byblius* himself, as might have been shewn in several Instances, and is on another occasion confessed by *Bochart* himself. If this were taken from him also, then it will at least follow, that this affinity between the *Names* of *Berith* and *Berytus*, could have been no occasion of mistake to *Philo Byblius*. Which as to our present purpose, is of much greater consequence, than what that same Learned Person observes from *Nonnus*, who takes *Berytus* for *Beroe*, the Daughter of *Venus* and *Adonis*. This therefore, looks like one of those ill-meant Blunders, which those Modern *Greeks* were ordinarily guilty of in the *Jewish* History, who pretended, no doubt from the like Records, to give other accounts of them, than their own writings had done of themselves, only with a design to asperse their Nation. Thus *Moses* is made a Woman, called *Moso* by *Alexander Polyhistor*. *Moses* and *Joseph* are joyned

Phœn. Col. 11, 12.

Suid. Μωσὼ. ap. *Joseph.* c. Ap. 1. 1057.

joyned together as *contemporaries* in *Chæremon*. But *Moſes* is the Son of *Joſeph* in *Trogus Pompeius*, Epitomiz'd by *Juſtin*. Many more Inſtances might have been given, if it had been neceſſary. Nor will the Anſwer of *Bochart* ſerve to excuſe him here. כהן may indeed alone ſignifie a *Prince* as well as a *Prieſt*. But when it is joined with the *God*, to whom he is ſaid to have been *Prieſt*, that were alone ſufficient to determine the ſignification, from any ambiguity of which it might otherwiſe have been capable. But beſides I ſhall (*) hereafter have occaſion to ſhew his deſign in making him a *Prieſt*, for recommending what he was to deliver on his *Teſtimony*.

Juſt. Hiſt. xxxvi. 2.

(*) §. 38.

§. XXII. BUT poſſibly his pretended *Memoires* of *Gideon*, might have given him the Title of *Prieſt*, and *Sanchoniathon* a *Stranger*, a likely occaſion of ſuch a miſtake. If they did ſo, then this it ſelf had been a ſufficient Argument, that they could not have been *Gideon*'s. And then, what credit muſt that part of his hiſtory be of, which relyes on ſo uncreditable Informations? And indeed, how unlikely is it, that *Gideon* ſhould have left ſuch *Memoires* behind him? In all likelyhood, what had come from him,

would have been *accounted Prophetical*; at leaſt, if it had been undoubted, would have been made ſo by the atteſtation of the *Sanhedrim*, who were by God himſelf eſtabliſhed for the Authentical *Judges* of *Prophets*. Which is the moſt defenſible way for aſſerting the Divinity of the *Anonymous* Authors of the *Old Teſtament*. And if ſo, what probability had there been of their miſcarriage? Nay, ſuppoſing them only *Human*, and of no higher repute among the *Jews*; yet, who can think they would have neglected ſo precious a Monument of their *Antiquity*, from ſo ſure a hand as *Gideon*'s? But there is not the leaſt *Memory* of ſuch a Work among the *Jews*, not in their *Canonical Hiſtories*; not in the multitudes even of *Counterfeits*, that were Antient, or were ever received, even among the *Helleniſts*, of which we have any account, either in their Antient *Stichometriæ*, or in any Antient *Quotations*; not ſo much as in any *Quotation* of thoſe *Canonical Writers* that lived near thoſe times, and quote ſeveral extant then, which have ſince miſcarried, as the Book of *Jaſher*, of the *Wars of the Lord*, &c. Not even in the Book of *Judges*, where his Teſtimony had been moſt uſeful for continuing the *Jewiſh* Hiſtory,

History, from the death of *Joshua*, to his own time. Can we think they would thus generally have neglected him, if they had known him, or thought him Genuine? Can we think the *Phœnicians* would have valued him, if his own *Country-men* had so neglected him?

§. XXIII. Certainly, if he ever had any such *Memoires*, or made use of them any where, it must have been, most probably, where, he gives account of *Jewish* matters. But his accounts concerning them, are so full of *mistakes*, of mistakes so inconsistent even with *Jewish* Interest, as could not, with any probability, have been occasioned by any *Jewish* Testimonies; much less by so grave an unexceptionable a Testimony as that of *Gideon*. I have had occasion to mention one instance already, that of his making *Gideon* a *Priest*. And such generally are the rest of his accounts of *Jewish* affairs, as far as we can judge of them, by the few Fragments preserved to us by *Porphyry*. He makes *Abraham* a Native *Phœnician*, and the same with the *Greek* Saturn, who bestowed *Attica* on *Minerva*. What *Jew* would have rob'd his Nation of their *Father Abraham* they so much boasted of, would have derived them from the *Uncir-*

By the Name of *Saturn* ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 36. C. p. 38. D.

cumcised

cumciſed Philiſtines, ſo much abhorred and deſpiſed by them? Would have diſhonoured *Abraham* himſelf, ſo far as to have made him a *Heathen Deity*, a thing ſo deteſted by the *Jews*? He makes him *actually* Sacrifice his Son. It is plain what Intereſt obliged him to ſay ſo, *viz.* that he might hereby give an account of that Antient, but Inhuman Cuſtom, of *Sacrificing* their own Children to him, under the name of *Saturn* or *Moloch*. For this was generally the deſign of the *Heathen Myſteries*, to commemorate ſome memorable Action of their *Deity*. Thus the pleaſure that *Ceres* took in the obſcene behaviour of *Baubo*, was commemorated in the *Eleuſinian Myſteries*. And the like delight that *Hercules* took in the *Plow-man's Curſes*, when he was eating his Plow-Oxen, was alſo remembred with the like *Curſes* ſtill repeated in the Solemnities of the Worſhip of *Hercules*. But what ground could he have in doing ſo, from the *Old Teſtament*? He might indeed from the later *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Helleniſts*, who ſpeak of it as done, becauſe it was reckoned to him as done in the *Divine acceptance*, *Gen.* xxii. 16. Therefore St. *Paul* ſays he *Offered him*, *Heb.* xi. 17. adding withal, that he *re-*

ceived

ceived him from Death in a Figure, v. 19. And the expression of having actually *offered him*, is also used by St. *Clemens* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*. If it were hence that he derived his mistake, that will also prove him Counterfeited about the time he was first produced. He gives also different accounts of the reason why *Abraham* should have offered his Son. Sometimes, κινδύνων ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατειληφότων τὴν χώραν sometimes again, λοιμοῦ γενομένου ἐφθορᾶς. I know not whether any occasion of the former account, might have been taken from 2 *Kings* iii. 27. *Am.* i. 16. where the King of *Moab* being pressed by distress of *War*, offer'd a *First-born* Son; but not his own, but the King of *Edoms*. But there is no pretence of either in *Abraham*'s case from any *Jewish* Records, nor consequently could he have these different Informations from the *Memoires* of *Gideon*, unless we can suppose them, not only different from all the Authentick Records of his *Nation*, but from themselves also, these things being the Principal in this Author, that concern the *Jews*, and yet, being so impossible to have been taken from any *Memoires* of *Gideon*, make me verily suspect, that the Forger of this Author himself, as he did not

Clem. ad Corinth. Ep. 1. §. 10.

P. 40. D.
P. 38. D.

not *uſe*, ſo neither did he know of any ſuch *Memoires*, either truly or pretendedly paſſing under the Name of *Gideon*, at leaſt, not owned for ſuch among the *Jews*. Which as it is a clear conviction of his deſigned diſingenuity in a matter not excuſable by any pretence of Ignorance; ſo it will render him juſtly liable to a ſuſpicion of a like diſingenuity in his other fair pretences, though we had not the like evidence of conviction of them. At leaſt no ſuch pretences to means of Information muſt be truſted on his *word*, and there is no better pretended for them.

§. XXIV. BUT, to let the Informations alone, the work it ſelf affords Intrinſick Arguments enough of juſt ſuſpition. A great occaſion of the *Forgeries* of thoſe times, was the *Emulation* of ſeveral Nations, for glory of Inventions and Antiquity. Hence it came to paſs, that of all glorious Inventions, and of all Famous Perſons, ſo very different and inconſiſtent accounts are given by the *Hiſtorians* of the ſeveral Rival Nations, each of them challenging them for their own. Hence ſuch a multitude of *Jupiters*, *Hercules*'s *Æſculapius*'s, *Diana*'s, &c. nay, and of *Homers* too, different not only in Nation,

on, but in Age too, yet pretending gene-
rally to the glory of the ſame Actions.
t muſt needs be, that of ſo inconſiſtent
eports concerning the ſame Perſon, all
ut one muſt have been not miſtakes,
ut deſigned *Forgeries*. Which I there-
ore note to ſhew that, as it was not unu-
ual, ſo neither was it new, to *Forge* on
uch occaſions. Yet they pretended ge-
nerally to honeſt means of Information.
Now this pretended *Sanchoniathon*, is full
of this vanity of arrogating uſeful Inven-
tions and Perſons to his own *Phœnicia*.
Which, as they will prove him *later* than
theſe *Æmulations* of ſeveral Nations about
Antiquity, much later than the time pre-
tended for the true *Sanchoniathon*; ſo
they will expoſe him to all the *Teſtimonies*
and *Arguments* that may be produced for
the ſeveral Nations againſt him in *all*, or
any of the reſpective Particulars. If he
can be diſproved or charged with indirect
dealing in any one particular, that will be
ſufficient to weaken his credit in all the
reſt. Let us come therefore to the par-
ticulars.

XXV. THUS he aſcribes the Invention of
Iron, to the *Phœnician* Χρυσὼρ, in all like-
lihood, the ſame with Χρυσάωρ in *Heſiod*,
whom he makes the Famous *Vulcan*; where-
as

Ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 35. C.

Heſiod. Theolog. 281. 287. as the *Scripture* attributes the ſame to *Tubal Cain*, and the *Græcians*, to the *Idæi Dactyli*, not long before the Wars of *Troy*. For *there* we find that all the *Arms* of the *Heroes*, both *offenſive* and *defenſive*, were of *Braſs*, as appears by *Homer*, and is obſerved by the *Scholiaſt*, on *Apollonius Rhodius* and *Pauſanias*, which are great ſuſpicions that the Invention of *Iron* was late, becauſe it had not as yet reached thoſe Parts. But it is indeed ſtrange, that *Vulcan* ſhould here be taken for a *Phœnician*, who is by the *Ægyptians*, reported to have been the notorious Original of the firſt Generation of their *Deified Kings*; The deſign of which *Deifying* being obſerved by this *Philo* himſelf, to have been the honour of ſome profitable Invention for Human Life, will make it likewiſe probable, that he was alſo taken for the *Inventor* of *Fire* and *Iron*. There were indeed ſeveral *Vulcans* obſerved by the *Antients*, but not above *Four*, and among them none that appears to have been thought *Phœnician*. Thus alſo he makes *Magus* the Son of the Αλῆ and *Titanes*, which were accounted bad *Demons*. Who ſees not here an inſtance of that ordinary vanity of the *Græcians*, of turning the *Name* of the *Sect* into a pro-

Cl. Al. Str. 1. In *Apoll.* Argonnut. L. 1. v. 430. 1196. *Paus. an.* Laconic. p. 84.

Herodot. *Euſeb.* Græc. *Manetho* p. 6. 7. *Ammian Mercellin.* in Inſcrip. in L. xvii. Apud *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. D. *Cicer.* de Nat. Deor. L. III. *Cl. Alex.* Prot. *Arnob.* L. 4. Ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 35. D.

per

per Name of a *Man*, and thence pretending to give an account of their first Institution? Who sees not a plain design to rob the *Chaldæans* of the *Magi*, and to make them a *Phœnician* Invention? Which let him believe, who can find in his heart to do so. I need not to observe, that the whole Sect of the *Magi*, if they were first instituted by the *Chaldæan Zoroastres*, (who seems to have lived near the time of *Pythagoras*, and is said by some to have conversed with him) they must have been Instituted long after the time of our pretended *Sanchoniathon*, and therefore could not have been taken notice of by him. As for the *Bactrian Zoroastres*, I doubt the very pretending to him was only such another design of robbing the *Chaldæans* of him. *Diodorus* calls him *Oxyartes*, and that was, it may be, his true Name. I might also observe, that when he makes this *Magus* the Son of those *bad Dæmons*, he evidently alludes to the *bad sense* of the Name of *Magus*, which was yet very much later than the Institution of the *Sect* it self. L. II. Bibl. ex *Ctesia*.

§. XXVI. HE also makes the *Dioscuri*, not only *Phœnicians*, but the same also with the *Corybantes* and *Curetes*. It is evident he could not understand the Ap. *Euseb.* p. 36. *a*.

Castores,

Castores, who were not only *later* than *Sanchoniathon*, but than those *Curetes* and *Corybantes* also. The most candid sense that can be put upon it, is by the name *Dioscuri* to understand, not the *Sons*, but the *Nurses* of *Jupiter*. So indeed the word κουρίζειν is used in *Hesiod* for *Nursing*. And so the *Curetes* or *Corybantes*, are in Truth, said to have *Nursed* him in the *Antrum Idæum*. But then, the word being *Greek*, could not have been known to the *Phœnician Sanchoniathon*; and what word must have answered it in his Original *Phœnician*, is not easie to guess. Nor do I know why *Philo* should use it in so unusual a Notion, which yet he elsewhere uses for them absolutely, without the explicatory Addition of the Titles of *Curetes* or *Corybantes*. And is not this a plain design upon the *Cretan Jupiter*, to make him, as well as his *Nurses* Originally *Phœnician*? But this may possibly be thought excusable as an *Interpolation* of the *Translator*, who must at least, have been the Author of that *Greek* word. For it seems evident, not only from this, but the mention of several other *Greek* words, and of the *Greek* Nation, nay, of the very *Alexandrians*, that he did

Theog. v. 347.

Ap. *Euseb. Ib.* p. 37.

Greek words, Δαγὼν ὥς ἐστι Σίτων, p. 36. because Ζεὺς ἀρότριος, p. 27. Οὐρανὸς, Κρόνος, Ἑρμῆς, &c. &. p. 39. where he quotes *Hesiod*, &c.

did use the liberty, rather of a *Paraphrast*, than of a faithful accurate *Translator*. But then, how shall we be able to distinguish between his *Interpolations*, and the *Text* of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. It seems also strange, that these *Corybantes* or *Cabiri*, or *Samothraces*, which, by the *Græcians* account of them, seem to have been the same, and to have accompanied the *Mater Deorum* out of *Phrygia* into *Crete*, should here be made immediately *Phœnicians*, though I am apt to believe indeed that their *Mysteries* had some *Originally-Phœnician* Ingredients. But it is yet more strange, how they should have found *Crete* inhabited, where they must have *Nursed*, or at least, *received Jupiter*, if themselves had been the first *Inventors of Ships*, as is here pretended, unless possibly they made use of those hard shifts, which are here also mentioned, as invented before. Which yet is hardly credible of so great a *Multitude* as might be thought sufficient to People the whole Island.

Bochart. de Phœn. Colon. l. 1. c. 2.

Ib. p. 36. A.

§. XXVII. Other instances there are of the like *Vanity* and *Affectation* in this Author. Some I have had occasion to touch at formerly. Who can endure to see (1) *Abraham*, to see the famous *Ægyptian*

(1) Ap. Euſ. Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 38. D. & p. 40. C.

(2) *Ib.* p. 36. A. p. 39. B.

an (2) *Hermes*, made Original *Phœnicians*? This alone, one would think, were ſufficient to overthrow thoſe great Elogies that are given him for his *Faithfulneſs* and *Diligence*, but this is not all.

Ib. p. 38. A. *Ib.* D.

Jupiter Belus, the famous Founder of the *Aſſyrian* Monarchy, *Typhon* the Brother of the famous *Ægyptian Oſiris* muſt alſo be made Originally *Phœnicians*; than which what can be more *certainly falſe*, if any thing be *certain* in the Antient *Aſſyrian* or *Ægyptian Hiſtories*. So muſt alſo *Adodus* the Father of *Benhadad* King of *Syria* in the *Scripture*, and in *Trogus Pompeius*, and worſhipped by the *Syrians* for a *God*. So muſt *Æſculapius*, whoſe Sons were *Peloponneſians* and on that account preſent at the War of *Troy*; beſides that himſelf is reported to have been the Son of *Arſinoe* the Daughter of *Leucippus* a *Meſſenian*. So muſt alſo *Minerva*, if ſhe had *Attica* beſtowed on her by the *Phœnician Saturn*. But when were the *Phœnicians* ſo famous for their Conqueſts, as to have ſo great and remote Dominions as *Ægypt*, *Aſſyria* and *Attica* at their diſpoſal? What writer, even of their own, however partial to his own Country, did ſo much as pretend it before our pretended *Sanchoniathon*

Meſſenians. Pauſan. in *Meſſen.* p. 113. *Corin.* p. 68. & alibi.

bon ? But it is a ſtrange miſtake in *Chronology* (in which it ſeems to have been a ſpecial Providence of God for their Diſcovery, that *Counterfeiters* have generally been unskillful) that ſhe ſhould be made *contemporary*, or rather later (*) than *Æſculapius*, as will appear by our Authors computation; whereas *Æſculapius* flouriſhed, as I ſaid before, but little before the War of *Troy*, but *Minerva* ſtrove with *Neptune*, for the Dominion of *Attica* in the time of *Cecrops Diphyes*, ſome hundreds of Years before. There were indeed ſeveral *Minervæ* and *Æſculapii* pretended by them, who had the curioſity to enquire into them, in order to the expoſing them. But this very pretence of a *Multitude*, was later than the times of *Æmulation*, and yet none of thoſe Multitudes pretended to have been *Phœnicians*. The paſſage of *Damaſcius* concerning a *Phœnician Æſculapius*, ſeems plainly tranſcribed from *Philo Byblius*, and therefore ought not to be taken for a diſtinct Authority.

(*) For ſhe is made the Daughter of *Saturn*, p. 36. D. But *Eſculapius* is made the Son of *Syduc*, the Brother of *Miſor*, whoſe Son *Mercury* is ſaid to have been Counſellor to *Saturn* as ſoon as he was come to Man's Eſtate, p. 36. D. And the *Poſterity* of the *Dioſcuri* are made contemporary with *Saturn*, p. 37. B. Which *Dioſcuri* themſelves were Sons of *Syduc*, and conſequently *Brethren* to *Æſculapius*. See p. 36. A.

Damaſc. vit. Iſidor. ap. *Phot.* Cod. ccxlii. p. 1073.

Ib. p. 38. D. §. XXVIII. AND why ſhould *Abraham*, if he were the *Phœnician Saturn*, *Circumciſe* himſelf, as this Author alſo pretends, when it is ſo well known, that the Antient *Phœnicians* were ſo averſe to it, that a long time after *Abraham*'s death they are ſtill ſtigmatized by the name of the *uncircumciſed Philiſtines*? But the deſign is plain. He had a mind to challenge a Perſon of ſuch Note for his Country-man; and becauſe the Story of *Abraham*'s making a Covenant with God by *Circumciſion*, was one of the moſt memorable paſſages of that Great Man's Life therefore he thought it fit to aſſert it to their *Saturn*. And it may be the rather becauſe by this time, when this work was Counterfeited, the *Phœnicians* themſelves ſeem alſo to have received *Circumciſion* from the *Ægyptians*. Who knows but that ſuch Tales as theſe might have been the reaſon why *Abraham* was worſhipped at *Mamre*, for ſome conſiderable time before *Conſtantine* who firſt forbad it, with *Idols* and *Sacrifices*; by *Gentiles* as well as *Chriſtians*; by *Phœnicians* as well as thoſe of *Palæſtine* and *Arabia*? That Human *Sacrifices* were not among thoſe they are particularized by *Sozomen* (though they were otherwiſe the pre-

Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. III. 53. *Sozomen.* Eccl. Hiſt. II. 4.

pere

reſt for the *Phœnician Saturn*) there s very good reaſon, becauſe they had en, long before that time, forbidden *Roman Laws*. The Firſt *Roman Law* inſt them was at *Rome*, *An.* 21. C. 657. *Cornelius Lentulus* and P. *Licinius-ſſus* being (1) *Conſuls*. After that it s particularly forbidden the *Druids* by) *Tiberius*, at laſt forbidden every here by the Emperor (3) *Hadrian*. ſides that by the account *Philo Biblyus* nſelf, as well as other Writers of *Phœ-ian* Affairs, give concerning them; theſe *man Sacrifices*, by the Rules of the *oenicians* themſelves, ſeem not to have en ordinary, but only reſerved for ſome ry great *diſtreſs*, as an *expiation* to that *gry Dæmon*. But all theſe inſtances do undantly ſhew how extreamly partial is Author was, in adorning his own lation with the ſpoils of others. Which not reconcileable either with the *Vera-y* or *Antiquity* of the true *Sanchonia-n*. Nor will any ſuppoſable miſtakes *Philo* in *tranſlating* him, ſerve to bring m off in ſo groſs and deſigned inſtances ncerning his *Neighbours* and the *Famous erſons* now mentioned. For they ncern *Things*, not *Words* and *Ex-eſſions*; Things very notorious, not

(1 2) *Plin.* Nat. Hiſt. xxx. c. 1.

(3) *Porph.* de Abſt. 11. 56.

only of *Probable* or *Conjectural* Evidence.

§. XXIX. I cannot therefore but think this Author Counterfeited purposely with a design of confronting the *Antiquity* o the *Scripture*. But who was the *Impostor* whether *Philo Byblius* or *Porphyry*, tha I confess I cannot easily determine. confess I should rather charge it on *Porphyry*, the abusing of the Name of *Philo* as well as that of *Sanchoniathon*, were i not for that only Testimony of *Athenæus* and I have given my reasons why I shoul otherwise have thought it improbable tha *Philo* was the Author of that *Translation* But because I cannot tell what to say t that expres Quotation of *Athenæus* be fore the time of *Porphyry*, I doubt *Phil* will not easily be discharged of it. Fo by his Exceptions against the Testimon of *Hecatæus* for what he had Written i *favour* of the *Jews*, That either his wor must have been counterfeited; or if ge nuine, that he himself must have bee carried away by the *plausibility* of th *Jewish pretences*: It appears that he wa engaged in that Dispute concerning th *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, and engaged *again* the *Jews*, and therefore was a Person su ficiently interested to set on such a disi genuou

Συνηρπάσθη ἀπὸ (ὑπὸ) τῶν Ἰουδαίων πιθανότητος *Philo* ap. *Orig.* cont. Cels. l. p. 13.

enuous design as far as his *Principles* ould give him leave. And I have al-ady ſhewn how far *Platonical Principles* d ſo. If I may venture to gueſs in a atter that affords no better Arguments an *gueſſes*, I ſhould ſuſpect that *Joſe-us*'s Books againſt *Appion* were the oc-aſion of engaging *Philo* on this Subject. What *Joſephus* had there produced in de-nce of the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, was ry probably the πάνυ alluded to by *hilo*. I cannot think any other was ant, becauſe *Joſephus* ſeems to have en the *firſt* that engaged in that Diſ-te (he does not intimate in the leaſt at any had engaged in it before him) d becauſe the time was ſo ſhort between *ſephus* and *Philo*, that there could hard-be any new occaſion for any one elſe undertake that cauſe that *Joſephus* had very lately, and ſo accurately defend-d. For *Joſephus* wrote his Books againſt *ppion* immediately after his *Antiquities* d his *Life*, in the Thirteenth Year of *Domitian*, becauſe he dedicated theſe alſo the ſame *Epaphroditus*, who was put to eath in the Year following; and *Philo* ems to have written under *Hadrian*. ſides the fame of *Joſephus*, with all well-iſhers to Learning, and the Eminent ca-

pacities he ſerved in, both among his own *Country-men*, and in the Courts of the *Veſpaſians*, added no doubt a greater Authority to what came from him, and recommended it to the Reading of all curious Perſons, not now to mention the Atteſtations of the *Emperors*, and of King *Agrippa*, and of other Learned Men, *Heathens* as well as others, among whom himſelf reckons *Julius Archelaus* and *Herod*. And this very Teſtimony of *Hecataeus*, which it ſeems ſo gravelled *Philo*, had been produced, and inſiſted on, in this very work by *Joſephus*. Which will therefore make it very probable, that this Work of *Philo Byblius* againſt the *Jews* was deſigned in anſwer to *Joſephus* againſt *Appion*.

C. *App.* I. 1037. F.

Cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1048. B. 11. p. 1063. F.

Cont. *App.* L. 1. p. 1039. C. §. XXX. WHICH being ſuppoſed, I conſider further that *Joſephus* in that ſame Work had principally inſiſted on the Teſtimonies of *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, for proving the *Antiquity* of his own *Nation*, as of thoſe who had beſt reaſon to know them; but the *Phœnicians* moſt of all, as being neareſt. Accordingly he Appeals not only to their *Writers* that were extant, but their written *Records*, their Ἀναγραφαὶ, which were preſerved to that very time. This could not chooſe but

C. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1043. E. *Antiq.* viii. 2. p. 258. F. C. *Appion.* 1. p. 1042. B.

but particularly move *Philo Byblius* as being himſelf a *Phœnician*, and who might very well have known *Joſephus* himſelf, if he were Threeſcore and Eighteen years old, at the Two hundred and twentieth *Olympiad*, as has been obſerved out of *Suidas*, though poſſibly the *odd* Number of the *Olympiad*, above Two hundred and twenty, which is requiſite to make him live to Write concerning the Empire of *Hadrian*, is wanting. I mention not *Scaliger*'s Ἀναγεφὴ which tells us more particularly, not the *Olympiad* only, but alſo the very year wherein he conceives him to have Written, becauſe it is of no Authority. But there was another thing that added further to the reputation of the *Jews* about that time. Their *Eſſenes* had been in great reputation with as many as had occaſion to hear of them, as a very *Philoſophical* ſort of Perſons. *Pliny* the Elder had mentioned them with great reſpect, as afterwards *Porphyry* did alſo. But this concerned only their *Philoſophy* of living. There were alſo among them, others who had written *Books* of *Philoſophy*, not only *Ariſtobulus* the *Peripatetick* in the time of *Ptolomæus Philometor*; not only many others intimated, though not named by *Philo* the *Jew*, and *Joſephus*, if

Nat. Hiſt. v. 17. de Abſtin. iv. §. 11. &c.

if he ever lived to finish that work of the Sentiments of the *Jews*, so often promised by him, as I doubt, he did not. These, by Mysticizing the Κοσμογενία of *Moses* to a sense, not very distant from that received among the wisest *Philosophers*, and in a most elegant, rapturous, modish stile (such was that of *Philo* particularly.) They gained so much further on the good opinion of the wise ones of that Age, as to have their Nation, which had formerly been despised as *Barbarous*, now to pass among the Nations which were Famous for Wisdom. And the rather because this way of *Mysticizing* the *Poets*, for the *Greeks*, into a *Systeme* of *Philosophy*, was already taken up by the *Stoicks*, and the other *Dogmatical Philosophers*, who were concerned for the defence of the received *Religions* against the *Atheists* and *Epicuræans*, and *Scepticks*, who had taken great advantage from those *Fables*, for exposing them. Who had withal, been herein imitated by the *Ægyptians*, who had *Allegorized Isis* and *Osiris*, and all their own most Antient Histories. From whom the *Alexandrian Jews* seem willing to differ as little as was possible. Accordingly *Laertius*, who wrote not long after, takes them into that Number; and

Præf. ad Antiq. in fin. & Ant. xx. 9. & alibi sæpe.

Proœm. ad vit. Philos. p. 3 B.

and endeavoured, as he was able, to give some account of them, though on the ill Informations of *Clearchus* the *Peripatetick*. So also *Numenius* before him. *Numen.* ap. *Orig.* c. *Cels.* 1. p. 13. & *Eus.* Pr. Ev. ix. 7.

§. XXXI. BUT there were also other things that contributed hereunto about the time of which I am speaking. One was the attestation of some *Oracles* received among the *Heathens* themselves, which also commended them for that very cause wherein they differed from the rest of Mankind. Such was that produced by St. *Justin Martyr*, not long after the time of *Philo*, as given by a *Heathen Deity* to a *Heathen Enquirer*: So he, Ἐρομένου γάρ τινος (ὡς αὐτοί φατε) τὸ πα ὑμῖν χρηστήριον, τίνας συνέβη θεοσεβεῖς ἀνδρὰς γεγενῆσθαί ποτε, οὕτω τὸ χρηστήριον εἰρηκέναι φατέ Parnætic. p. 12.

Μοῦνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίην λάχον ἠδ' ἄρ Ἑβραῖοι
Αὐτογενητὸν Ἄνακτα σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν αὐτὸν.

God might possibly in this Case, make the *Devil* speak against his own Interest, as he did in the case of *Balaam*. To the same purpose we have other *Oracles* also owned by *Porphyry* (very probably in his Body of *Philosophy Collected out of Oracles*,) whereof some might have been Antienter than the time of *Philo Byblius*. I am not concerned to Dispute what *real* Credit these *Oracles* deserved, yet certainly Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. x. 10.

tainly they could not chooſe but have been very powerful recommendations to thoſe *Philoſophers* who did actually believe them *Divine*, and that is all for which I am concerned at preſent. To the ſame purpoſe, alſo I refer the advantageous Characters of *Abraham* and *Moſes*, in the *Orphaicks* firſt mentioned in theſe firſt times of *Chriſtianity*. And as *Orpheus* had among the *Heathens* the Reputation of a *Sacred* and *Inſpired Perſon*, ſo his word muſt have been reverenced by them all; but particularly by the *Ægyptians*, and the Diſciples of *Mercury*, becauſe he was taken for a great promoter of their *Philoſophy*. But there was yet a further reaſon that might peculiarly recommend him to the *Ægyptians*. That is, that he was, by ſome Traditions, received by Perſons of great Authority among themſelves, pretended to have been a *Sacred Perſon* to the Deity of *Heliopolis*. So *Chæremon*, a Ἱερογραμματεὺς himſelf, makes *Joſeph* and *Moſes* alſo to have been *Ægyptian* Ἱερογραμματεῖς, in the ſame Notion as the *Jew* alſo had their *Sacred Scribes*. And *Manetho* a *High Prieſt* and *Scribe*, alſo had delivered the the ſame concerning *Moſes*, that his *Ægyptian* name was *Oſarſyph*, and that he was called ſo from *Oſiris*. So I read

Ap. *Joſeph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1057. B. *Manetho* ap. *Joſeph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1053. A. & 1054. A. 1055. C.

Ὀσίρεως

Ὁσίρεως rather than Ὀσίριος the God of *Heliopolis* to whom he was *Prieſt*. The occaſion of pretending this concerning *Joſeph*, might poſſibly be his Marrying the Daughter of *Potipherah* Prieſt of *On*, which by the *Greek* Interpreters and *Demetrius*, was rendred Ἡλιόπολις. Concerning *Moſes*, poſſibly it was his skill in all the *Learning of the Ægyptians*, that which was (1) *Sacred* as well as other ſorts, which they might think he could never have got in ſuch Perfection, if himſelf had not been a *Sacred Perſon*. It is no matter how far they were miſtaken in believing ſo concerning him. Their actual believing ſo, is ſufficient for my purpoſe, to make them entertain a great reverence for his *Philoſophy*.

Demetrius ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 21.

(1) *Philo. Jud.* de vit. *Moſ.* Lib. 1. p. 666. B. *Clem. Al.* Strom. 1. p. 343. C. D.

§. XXXII. ACCORDINGLY there was about that time a Sect of the *Philoſophers* themſelves, that began to take notice of thoſe *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Law*, and to produce them with reſpect as *Authorities*, with honourable mention of *Moſes* under the Titles of *Legiſlator* and *Prophet*. A name not unuſual to them among the other *Orientals* that were Famous for Wiſdom, but particularly uſed among the *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, and very properly belonging to him

as

as a *Scribe* or *Prieſt* of *Heliopolis*. *Porphyry* that inveterate Enemy of *Chriſtianity*, takes notice of them, as they who had led our *Chriſtian Origen* the way in his *Allegorical Expoſitions*. For ſuch he reckons *Numenius*, *Cronius*, *Apollophanes*, *Longinus*, *Moderatus*, *Nicomachus*, *Chæremon* and *Cornutus*. Theſe did not only follow the way of *Allegorizing*, in turning the *Heathen Theogonies* into *Myſtical* Senſes, as appears in the work ſtill extant of *Cornutus*, on that Subject. That was not new. The *Stoicks* whom both *Cornutus* and *Chæremon* followed, had begun that long before. They alſo followed the *Allegorizing Jews*, in allowing the Authority of *Moſes*, in quoting him by the name of ὁ Προφήτης only, which I think is not uſual with any but thoſe *Allegorical Writers*. Thus *Numenius*, with whom it was very ordinary. Thus *Longinus* in that only work which is extant of his, Περὶ Τόπων. And no doubt it would have appeared concerning more of them, if they had been extant. Nay thus even afterwards (when the rancours of the *Philoſophers* themſelves againſt the Scriptures were grown higher) *Porphyry* himſelf, and *Chalcidius*, who is therefore by ſome leſs conſidering Perſons miſtaken for

L. III. adv. *Chriſtian.* ap. *Euſeb.* Eccl. Hiſt. vi. 19.

Orig. c. *Celſ.* 1. p. 13. iv. p. 198, 199.

De antr. Nymph. p. 256.

for a *Chriſtian*, who yet preſumes to confute (*) his *Prophet* where he diſſents from him, though he do it indeed, as became the time he lived in, when the Empire was *Chriſtian*, with civility and great reſpect. And the firſt of theſe which are mentioned by *Porphyry* will, in all likelihood, be earlier than *Philo Byblius*. So will *Apollophanes*, if he were the ſame who was meant by the Counterfeiter of the Works now extant under the name of *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, who is there made to obſerve the *Eclipſe* at our *Saviours* Death at *Heliopolis* in *Ægypt*; and if that otherwiſe Learned Impoſtor have but obſerved the due *decorum* of time. Much more, if he were the *Stoick*, mentioned by *Athenæus*, but under the corrupt name of *Aphanes*, as contemporary with *Eratoſthenes*, and Fellow-Diſciple with him to *Ariſton Chius*. And ſome of his Companions in this paſſage of *Porphyry* were *Stoicks*, as *Cornutus* and *Chæremon*. So will *Numenius*, if it were to him that *Apollonius Tyanæus* wrote that Diſcourſe, whereof we have a Fragment in *Stobæus*. So will alſo *Cronius* for the ſame

(*) He reckons *Moſes* among thoſe who make *matter* to have a beginning p. 372. *Edit. Meurſii*. But he afterwards joyns himſelf with thoſe who make it *Eternal* p. 376. 401, 409. 410, &c. Beſides his ſaying concerning *Moſes*, *divina, ut ferunt, Inſpiratione vegetatus*, plainly implies, that he did not believe him ſo inſpired himſelf, but that he only delivered herein the Senſe of *others*.

Athen. Deipnoſ. vii. 6. vid. *Menag.* in *Laert.* L. vii. p. 186.

Eclog. Phyſic.

same reason, whom *Porphyrius* assures us to have been Ἑταῖρος, a Friend and acquaintance of *Numenius*. So was *Annæus Cornutus* certainly, and *Chæremon* the *Stoick*, contemporary with *Martial* under *Domitian*, who must yet have been old at that time, if it were his Book *de Cometis* which was mentioned by *Seneca*. And he is certainly quoted by *Josephus*.

De Antr. Nymph. p. 563.

To him *Persius* writes Sat. V. Lib. xi. Ep. 58. *Nat. Quæst.* L. vii. c. 5. confr. *Orig. c. Cels.* l. p. 45.

§. XXXIII. BUT there was also another occasion about this time, which made the *Jewish* Κοσμογενία more taken notice of. Which, though it seems indeed to have proceeded from this, yet recommended it farther, to many who knew nothing of the favourable esteem the formentioned *Philosophers* had for the *Jewish Philosophy* it self. That is, that it was about this time, taken into the pretended *Philosophy* of the *Ægyptian Hermes*. The name of *Hermes* had indeed been mentioned by many Authors before the coming of our Saviour. His *Pillars* also are said to have been consulted by *Manetho* for compiling his *History*. But for any *Philosophical Discourses* published under his name, such as the *Pœmander* and *Asclepius* now extant, such as were many more now lost, but mentioned by the *Antients*, I believe there can be no Testimonies produced much

in *Euseb. Præp.* p. 6.

much Antienter than *Philo Byblius*, at least not as extant in the common *Greek Character* as well as *Tongue*. And yet they could hardly have been much *later*, considering that St. *Justin Martyr* quotes them about the time of *Antoninus Pius*, as also his Contemporary *Apuleius*, if the *Latin* Translation of *Asclepius* be his, considering withal, that (1) *Plutarch* also mentions them, an Author undoubtedly equal, if not Antienter than *Philo Byblius*; that (2) *Ælian* does so who lived under *Hadrian*, Contemporary with *Philo*; considering also that before them, the *Ægyptian Hereticks*, the *Basilidians* especially, and the *Valentinians*, made use of many of his Notions. Now those *Hereticks* are generally by the consent of *Antiquity*, said to have risen about the time of *Hadrian*. But our most Learned Bishop of *Chester* * thinks them Antienter, to whom I refer the Reader for satisfaction that desires it. However, the Author from whom they borrowed their *Heresies*, should in all reason, be some while Antienter than they. And

(1) De Isid. & Osirid. Ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ λεγομέναις βίβλοις ἱστοροῦσι γεγράφθαι, &c. p. 375. F.

(2) He quotes ὑφήγησιν τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τῶν πρεσβυτάτων concerning the Marks of *Apis*, probably out of those Two and Forty *Mystical Books* of *Hermes*, which contained the *Rituals* of the *Ægyptian Priests*, mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, unless possibly he did not mean a *Book*, but a *Tradition* Fathered upon *Hermes*, like those mentioned by *Manetho*.

* Vind. *Ign.*

 from

from him it is most likely that the *Valentinians* took their *Ogdoas*, and the *Basilidians* their *Magical* Practices, that I may not now descend to a more particular Parallel. Nor yet can I think, as the Learned *Casaubon* does, that any *Christian* (even of those *Hereticks*) counterfeited him. There are such other marks in him, that the Author was indeed a *Heathen*. He calls the *Sun the greatest God of those that are in Heaven, to whom all the Heavenly Gods pay respect, as to their King and Potentate.* And he elsewhere mentions the *God's appearing in the Stars.* That he should call the *Sun God*, might indeed seem agreeable to the *Basilidian Hypothesis*, who made *Abraxas* theirs. But that he should allow all the *Stars* for *Gods* also, seems more than any *Christian* could grant. Yet even this Expression the *Hellenistical Jews* did not scruple. So *Philo* the *Jew*, speaking concerning the Creation of the *Heavens*, says, that it ought therefore to be created first, and of the purest part of *Matter*, Διὸν θεῶν ἀφθάρτων τε καὶ ἀθανάτων ἔμελλεν οἰκεῖα ἔσεσθαι ἱερώτατα. These Ἀθάνατοι Θεοὶ were no doubt the *Stars*. However there were many more things extant then, in the time of *Philo Byblius*, which did undeniably

Pæmand. c. 3. 25.

ib. c. 3. 17.

De Mund. Opif. p. 5. E.

bly prove the Author to have been a *Heathen*. Such were thoſe Books men-oned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, where- Strom. vi. all the whole Order of the *Ægiptian* p. 633. Vorſhip was particularly preſcribed, by hich their Idolatrous *Prieſts* in thoſe mes were guided.

§. XXXIV. YET though the Author f theſe Counterfeited Works, pretending o the name of *Hermes* were a *Heathen*, I uſt withal grant, that the great Perſon ow mentioned, had an occaſion for mi-aking him for a *Chriſtian*, from thoſe equent alluſions to the *Old Teſtament* riptures, which he had obſerved in him. ut I have already ſhewn another way ow theſe *Alluſions*, not expreſs *Quotati-s*, might have been uſed by a *Heathen* f that Age. That is, that the Coun-rfeiter of them, might have been one f that Sect of *Philoſophers*, who had, as s been ſhewn, taken in the *Jewiſh Phi-ſophy* into theirs, from the Writings of *hilo* and ſuch others as had recommend-d it to them, by their *Myſtical Expoſi-ons* of it. Accordingly, their Quotati-ns of the *Scriptures* themſelves, are ge-erally at the *Second hand*, as they found em already produced by ſuch Writers s they dealt with, not mentioning, or

but very rarely, either *Book* or *Author*, as in all likelyhood they would, if they had taken them immediately from the *Originals*. And this Party was more likely to propagate among the *Ægyptians* (such as these undoubtedly were who Forged the Works of *Hermes*) because the *Alexandrian Jews* were most Famous both for *Numbers* and *Learning*, above any of their Nation in any other Colony, had multitudes of their *Philosophical Essenes*, and a flourishing *Temple* among them to the days of *Vespasian*; and did no doubt, suit their Notions as near, as Truth would give them leave, to the *received* Doctrines of the *Ægyptians*, which were very plausible recommendations to them. And when it had thus got into the *Hermetical Philosophy*, by this means it was unawares insinuated into those who were most averse either to the *Jewish* or the *Christian* Religion, who yet had a great Veneration for the *Philosophy*, as was pretended, of the Antient and Deified *Hermes*. *Longinus* was one of them who yet wrote against the *Christians*. And *Porphyry* another, who yet was one of the greatest Adversaries, perhaps, that the *Christians* ever had. And this was the more likely to prevail among them

Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. xv. 20.

when

hen *Moſes* himſelf was taken for one of eir own *Prieſts*, and that of *Heliopolis*, here thoſe very *Pillars* are pretended have been, from whence the Doctrine *Mercury* was pretended to have been ollected, the cuſtody of which muſt, by eir Cuſtoms, been properly his Province a *Prieſt*. So that on this account, they ight preſume his Doctrine to have been e ſame with that of *Mercury*. But how uch more might they preſume it, if they ok his Perſon to have been the ſame ſo? And ſome of them were of that inion, if we may believe *Artapanus*. is I take to be a more likely account, w *Scripture Notions* got among the *Phi-ophers*, than the common miſtaken ſſage concerning *Ammonius* and the διδαχη. I am ſure it agrees much tter both with *Hiſtorical* Truth and *Ex-iments* than the other, however it has d the Fortune to take among Learned en.

Artap. ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27.

§. XXXV. To return therefore to *Philo blius*, this I take to be the moſt likely ſign of his forging the whole Hiſtory of pretended *Sanchoniathon*. He was, doubt, as a *Phœnician*, zealouſly con-rned for the honour of his Country. y his concernment for his own City

Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Κρόνος τεῖχος περιβάλλει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ οἰκήσει, καὶ πρώτην πόλιν κτίζει τὴν ἐπὶ Φοινίκης Βύβλον. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 37. A. and from him *Stephanus.* Nat. Hist. v. 20.

Byblos appears, in that he makes his fictitious Author pretend that it was the *First City* in *Phœnicia.* Had it been so, it is strange, it should never have been mentioned in the *Scriptures* before the times of the Prophets, where notwithstanding so many other *Phœnician* Cities are so frequently mentioned. The גבלי in *Josua* seems to be rather from *Gabala* a City of *Phœnicia*, distinct from *Byblios*, in *Ptolomy* and *Gamala* in *Pliny.* This very thing is a shrewd suspicion that *Sanchoniathon* was to say nothing but what *Philo Byblius* would have him, that though we have seen him so full of a partial *design* for the Honour of his Country; and though we have seen him guilty of so many *instances* of notorious *disingenuity* in that regard; and though this pretence concerning *Byblos*, appears, from the *Scripture*-description of *Phœnicia*, to have been as groundless a *fiction* as any he had been guilty of: Yet he should yield to the Interest of *Philo*, and make his *Byblos* a more Antient City even than his own beloved *Berytus*, when he might with as much ground have preferred his own City before it. The name of *Berytus* does certainly better resemble a *Phœnician* Original than that of *Byblos.* *Philo* therefore

bein

eing thus concerned; and being, by his oncernment, prompted to ſay many things oth new and falſe, and which could not e made appear from any Monuments s yet produced; thought himſelf therefore obliged to pretend ſome new means f *Information* for his pretended *Sanchoniathon*, in ſuch matters as he was to deiver without any known Authority of *xtant* Authors. And becauſe he knew he *Tyrian Records* and *Inſcriptions* had een ſearched and publiſhed before; he herefore makes his *Sanchoniathon* to enuire alſo into the *Records* and *Inſcriptions* f the other *particular Cities*. This ſeems to ave been his Artifice to reccommend hat he had to ſay in favour of his own City, in oppoſition to the other Cities of *Phœnicia*, or in favour of his Country, n oppoſition to ſuch Countries as had ot Authority of their own *Records* to oppoſe againſt him.

Ἐκ τῆς κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων, &c. *Porphyr.* ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 31. B.

§. XXXVI. BUT theſe were not the nly Adverſaries againſt whom his Ambiion had engaged him in this Work. He eems alſo in this very Work to have had a articular deſign upon the *Jews*. One whole *Book* of this work ſeems to have elated to them in particular. For that very ſame paſſage concerning *Abraham*'s

Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 40. B. Pr. Ev. iv. 16. p. 156. D.

Sacrificing *Isaac*, which *Eusebius* relates from the work of *Philo* Περὶ Ἰουδαίων that he produces elsewhere from the *First Book* of his *Phœnician* History. By this it should seem, both that the *proper Title* of the *First Book* was concerning the *Jews* (as many (*) Instances might have been given of such proper *Titles* of *Parts* of *larger Works* in those times) and that this *Book* distinct from *Philo*'s Preface, was reckoned as the *First Book*, which would again confirm what I said before to reconcile *Eusebius*, who reckons Nine *Books* of this *Phoenician* History with *Porphyry*, who reckons only Eight, that this *First Book* was taken into the Number of the *whole Work* by *Eusebius*, but left out by *Porphyry*, because it had a *distinct Title* by it self. Unless possibly the same passage in the *First Book* of the *Phoenician* History, were quoted by *Philo* in that other work of

(*) Thus it appears from the abrupt beginnings of many of *Philo*'s Works, that they were designed to continue others, though of *different Titles*. So St. *Lukes* Πρῶτον Λόγον was his *Gospel*, his *Second* is Πράξεις τ' Ἀποστόλων, written, no doubt at the same time, and intended to continue the same History where his *Gospel* left it. So *Josephus* after his *Antiquities*, immediately subjoyned his *Life* (as has already been observed by the most Learned Dr. *Isaac Vossius*) and after his *Life* his Books against *Appion*, yet so as that his *Life* and his Two Books against *Appion* kept their distinct Titles, none ever mentioning any more than Twenty Books of his *Antiquities*, excepting *Cassiodore*, who reckons Two and Twenty, *Div. Lect. c.* 17. No doubt the Two odd Books were those against *Appion*. So that it seems his *Life*, though added as an *Appendix* to his Twentieth Book, yet did not encrease the Number. So *Theophilus Antiochenus*'s Third

of his concerning the *Jews*, for I confeſs there is ſome difficulty in making them the ſame. However, for the preſent, ſuppoſing that he deſigned one *Book* principally to give an acount of *Jewiſh* Affairs; and that he had withal, a farther deſign of arrogating the principal ornaments of their Nation to his own (of which his other Work is alone ſufficient to render him ſuſpicious, though he had no particular Book of this that bore ſuch a Title) and that he knew that an account from *Phœnician* Records here, would not be taken for ſufficient to confront their own ſo much *better*, and more *Authentick* Teſtimonies concerning themſelves, eſpecially when confirmed with ſuch a concurrence of Teſtimonies of other Nations, *Phœnicians* as well as others, as he had ſeen produced by *Joſephus*:

Book *Ad Autolyc.* was not Antiently called the Third Book as it is now, but by a proper Title, *Liber de Temporibus ad Autolyc.* as appears from *Lactantius*, *Div. Inſt.* l. 23. and it plainly begins with a new addreſs, as if deſigning a new Argument. So *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Protreptick*, *Pædagogus* and *Stramateis* carry on the ſame deſign. So *Euſebius*'s Book *De Martyribus Palæſtinæ* plainly connects with the end of the *Eighth Book* of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, yet ſo as not to diſturb the account of his *Ten Books* of that whole work. So the ſame *Euſebius*'s Three Books againſt *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and Two *De Eccleſiaſtica Theologia* belong plainly to the ſame work. So the Seven Books of *Lactantius* of *Divine Inſtitutions*, have every one of them diſtinct *Titles*. But the inſtance of the Books of *Lucifer Calaritanus* is moſt remarkable. They were all deſigned as parts of the ſame work, written continuedly, and intended to be preſented at the ſame time to the Emperour *Conſtantius*. Yet no continuation of any one *number* of *Books*, or *Title*. There are Two in defence of *Athanaſius*, one *De Regibus Apoſtaticis*, another *De non conveniendo cum Hæreticis*, another *De non*

There-

Therefore it may be, he thought it fit his *Sanchoniathon* ſhould live in the time of *Abibalus* the Father of that *Hiram*, whoſe time was the higheſt Period of any *Phœnician* Teſtimonies, yet produced concerning *Jewiſh* Affairs.

Parcendo in Deum delinquentibus, and laſtly one *De eo quod moriendum ſit pro Dei filio*. I have been the more particular in theſe inſtances, becauſe as the Obſervations are uſeful, ſo I have not found them commonly taken notice of.

§. XXXVII. THIS time he makes either *equal*, or a little *before* the Deſtruction of *Troy*, when he makes his Author equal to *Semiramis*, who was, as he tells us, either *equal*, or a little *before* that *War*. Which yet is not ſo to be underſtood, as if he had fixed this time by the Age of *Semiramis*. No, he would have his *Abibalus* equal with her, whoſe Husband *Ninus* was taken, as I ſaid, for the utmoſt Period of *Heathen* Hiſtory. But the fixation of this time, was from the time of *Abibalus*, and that *Abibalus* no other than the Father of *Hiram*. His time indeed, according to the account that had already been given from the *Tyrian* Records by *Menander Epheſius*, will agree with what is ſaid concerning the War of *Troy*. For from the Twelfth of *Hiram*, concurrent with the Fourth of *Solomon* wherein the *Temple* was begun, to the building of *Carthage*

Carthage by *Dido* are reckoned One Hundred forty three years and Eight Months, by *Josephus* from *Menander*. If therefore *Dido* received *Æneas* coming from *Troy*, as *Virgil* and his Authors will have it (as undoubtedly so exact a Man as he had *Authors* for what he said, and there is nothing so certainly agreed among Authors concerning the building either of *Carthage* or *Rome* to contradict it) *Sanchoniathon* must then have been so much and more (as contemporary, not with *Hiram*, but *Abibalus*) before the War of *Troy*, as *Porphyry* himself does expressly place him. Which there would yet have been more pretence for with them who had followed the account of *Appian*, who makes the very building of *Carthage* to have been Fifty years Elder than the Destruction of *Troy*. I doubt not but it was a great mistake, but I am only concerned to shew what account, right or wrong, they might have followed who made him Elder than the War of *Troy*. But if this same number of One hundred forty three years and Eight Months was the distance between the War of

Joseph. c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1042. B. 1043. F. & apud *Eus.* Pr.Ev. X.13. From whom *Theophilus Antiochenus*'s account of that same Number from the same Authority is to be corrected L. ii. *ad Autolyc.* cxliii. for cxxxiv. And *Lanctantius* who usually followed *Theophilus* in his *Chronology* has cxl. neglecting the smaller number. *Div. Inst.* iv.8.

Οἱ δὲ τέτων χρόνοι καὶ πρὸ τῆ Τρωϊκῶν πίπτουσι χρόνων. *Porph.* ap. *Eus.* Pr.Ev. l.9.p.31.D.

Appian. Punic. init.

Chron. L. ii. Num. *Eusеb.* 971. of *Troy* and the building of *Carthage*, as *Eusebius* does conceive; then it will follow that he was about the time of that *War*. And to this exactly agrees the account of the same *Menander* and *Lætus*, (the *Publisher* and *Translator* of *Mochus*, *Hypsicrates* and *Theodotus*) who make *Menelaus* put in at *Phœnicia* in his return from *Troy* in the time of *Hiram*. This I take to be the true account of this doubtful dis-junction concerning this time, because it is so very agreeable with the then extant *Phœnician* Authors. As for the making *Sanchoniathon* equal with *Semiramis*, as it was indeed done very unskilfully; so it seems (as I said) to have been with a design to put him beyond all possibility of conviction by different Authors, making him hereby so far *superior* in time to any *Records* that might pretend to rival him, as that he must have been *equal* to the *utmost* Period of time, that they pretended with any confidence to give any account of.

Menander & *Lætus* ap. *Cl. Alex.* Strom. 1. p. 326.

§. XXXVIII. AND having placed him thus high, he was in course obliged to derive his *Means* of *Information* yet *higher*. But being to give an account of *Jewish* Affairs, upon the Credit (as I said) of *Jewish* Testimonies, yet very different from

from thoſe which were owned and received among the *Jews* themſelves; he was therefore obliged to bethink himſelf of ſome *Jewiſh* Name to Father his Records upon, of whoſe *Writings* the *Jews* themſelves had never heard. And the reaſons, why he was to make him a *Prieſt*, might be of two ſorts: That he might hereby recommend his Authors *Credit*, becauſe thoſe moſt Antient accounts of things were generally, as we have ſeen, derived from *Sacred Inſcriptions* in *Temples* pretended alſo to have been written either in *Hieroglyphicks*, or *Sacred Characters*, to which as the *Prieſts* were ſuppoſed to have the eaſieſt acceſs, ſo they were alſo, by thoſe *Myſtical Inſtructions* which they were obliged to know as *Prieſts*, beſt qualified for underſtanding them: And that he might alſo give an account why ſuch *unheard-of* Writings might have been ſo long concealed from *Vulgar* knowledge, becauſe being *Sacred*, and written by a *Sacred Perſon*, they might have been kept within the *Adyta*, only amongſt the *Prieſts*, which might alſo give an account how they might afterwards *miſcarry*, before the pretended *Sanchoniathon* was to appear to quote them, though they might have been ſuppoſed really extant when he

he was to *Collect* his Obſervations from them. Accordingly, whoever of the *Philoſophers*, made it his buſineſs to enquire into the *Monuments* of any place, whether *Hiſtorical*, or *Philoſophical*, made his addreſſes to the *Prieſts* of the place, whoſe *Antiquities* he was deſirous to learn. So *Pythagoras* in *Phœnicia* to the *Prophets*, the Poſterity of *Mochus*, in *Ægypt* to the *Heliopolitane*, *Memphitane* and *Dioſpolitane Prieſts*, particularly to *Oenuphis* or *Pſenuphis*, and perhaps *Sonchis*; *Solon* and *Lycurgus*, but particularly *Solon*, to the ſame *Prieſts* now mentioned; *Eudoxus* to *Chonuphis*, and *Plato* to *Sechnuphis*. And for *Plato*, on occaſion of his *Story* of the Iſland *Atlantis*, and the Exploits of his own Country-men the *Athenians* againſt them, for which he was beholden, not to any *Athenian* Monuments, but only to thoſe pretended to by the *Ægyptian Saitane Prieſts*: So he thought himſelf concerned, as well as he could, to defend their *Credit*, and to do it by theſe degrees. Firſt, though this was only a matter of *Secular Hiſtory*, yet for the better recommendation of it, he refers, not to *Secular*, but *Sacred Records*. Next he aſſigns theſe *Sacred Writings*, as was undoubtedly moſt proper, to the cuſtody

Jamblich. de vit. *Pythagor. Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag. Plutarch. Solon* & de *Iſid.* & *Oſirid. Clem. Al.* Strom. 1. p. 303.

In *Tim.* init.

cuſtody of the *Prieſts*. Then he inſinuates a Recommendation of the *Credit* of their *Prieſts*, beyond any of other places that might be oppoſed to them, from the particular conveniences they enjoyed, above others, for addicting themſelves wholly to the employment of their own Profeſſion, and their unmixedneſs with the Prophane Vulgar. Accordingly they who, before *Sanchoniathon*, pretended to Publiſh their own Records, were generally *Prieſts*. So was *Beroſus* and *Manetho*, and *Chæremon*. And *Manetho* aſſumes the Title in the very *Dedication* of his Work, as if it were purpoſely to add the greater credit to his performance. And though the *Jews* pretended to no ſuch *Sacred Pillars* or *Inſcriptions*; nor ever kept their *Sacred Books* ſo reſerved from the *Vulgar*, either in *Sacred* unknown *Characters*, or by laying them up in the *Adyta*; yet becauſe it was faſhionable, they alſo inſiſted on the ſame way of defending their own *Records* againſt the *Heathens* who contradicted them. So *Joſephus* alſo reaſons. He alſo derives his *Information* from the *Sacred Records* of his own *Nation*. He makes the *preſerving* theſe *Records* the peculiar Province of their *Prieſts*. He inſiſts on the ſame *Qualifications*

Ap. *Euſeb.* Chr. Gr. p. 6.

Cont. *Apion.* L. 1. p. 1036.

lifications of their *Prieſts*, which *Plato* has uſed before him, their *Separation* from *Secular* Employments, and their *unmixedneſs* with Vulgar *Affinities*. And as often as he has occaſion to vindicate his own *Credit*, either againſt *Juſtus Tiberienſis*, or the then *Gentile* Authors who had given other accounts of the *Jewiſh War*, than he had done, though this were not a Subject wherein he could pretend any *Sacred Records*, yet ſtill he inſiſts on this Topick of his being a *Prieſt* for Vindicating his own *Hiſtorical Credit* againſt them. So that from hence the Learned *Bochart* might have ſeen a very uſeful reaſon why *Sanchoniathon*, when he makes his *Hierombaal* not only a *Jew*, but a *Prieſt*, ſhould alſo underſtand the name *Prieſt* in the *Sacred* and *Popular* ſignification.

Antiq. xvi. 11. p. 563. E. cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1038. A.

§. XXXIX. AND having thus made him a *Jew* and a *Prieſt*, it followed farther, that he was to be made a *Prieſt* of the *God* of the *Jews*. But *Jao* (which is the ſame name with *Jevo*, and is read for it in this ſame paſſage of *Porphyry* concerning *Sanchoniathon*, as we have it in *Theodoret*) is the name by which the *God* of the *Jews* was known among the *Heathens*, even before the time of *Philo Biblyus*. *Diodorus Siculus* in the time of *Auguſtus*, had expreſly

Theodoret. Therap. ii.

Biblio. thec. L. ii.

expreſly made *Jao* to be the *God* from whom *Moſes*, as he would have it believed, *pretended* to have received his *Laws*. And it may alſo hence be conjectured why he pitched on *Gideon* rather than any other on whom he was to Father his Forgeries. He deſignedly chooſes to call him by his *Sir-name* of *Hierombaal*, rather than his *Original* name of *Gideon*, poſſibly becauſe it was the Faſhion, as on other occaſions, ſo on the undertaking the Office of a *Prieſt*, for thoſe *Orientals*, to *change* their *names*, as one Ceremony of their *Conſecration*. Thus *Joſeph*, whom they made a Ἱερογραμματεύς, had the *Ægyptian name* given him of *Pſonthom-phanech* in the Scripture, but *Peteſeph* in *Chæremon*; *Moſes* that of *Oſarſiph* in *Manetho* *Tiſithen* in *Chæremon*, *Joachim*, but eſpecially *Melchi* with the *Myſtæ* in *Clemens Alexandrinus*. And this might alſo have been the reaſon why *Nebuchadnezzar* changed the *names* of *Daniel* and the *Three Children* when he had given them up to the Inſtitution of the *Chaldæans* who were reputed Sacred among them. And upon this account, as I ſaid, he might the

Chæremon ap. *Joſeph.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1057. B.

Oſarſiph ap. *Maneth. Joſ.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1054. A *Tiſithen* ap. *Chæremon. Joſeph.* ib. p. 1057. B.

Joachim and *Melchi* after his Aſſumption into Heaven. *Clem. Alexandr.* Strom. 1. p. 343. C.

rather make a *Prieſt* of *Gideon*, becauſe there is none of the *Judges* but he that has any more than one name given him in the Scripture. But inſiſting on his Authority as a *Prieſt*, he might think it more convenient to call him by his *Myſtical Name*, rather than by that by which he was commonly known. Beſides, who knows but he might purpoſely pitch upon the name Ἱεροβαὰλ that the very name might ſeem to the *Greeks* (for whom he deſigned his pretended Tranſlation) to imply his being a Ἱερεύς? There are innumerable Examples of the like abſurd Etymologies of Words of other Tongues, eſpecially among *Myſtical* Writers of all ſorts, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, from *Greek Originals*, which yet generally prevailed. How much more eaſie was it for him to impoſe on them in a Tongue ſo little underſtood by them as the *Hebrew* or *Punick*? They themſelves took a Liberty of doing it, when they had a mind to prove their own *Fictions* from ſuch ignorant *Etymologies*. Thus *Lyſimachus* proved that the *Jews* had built their City *Hieruſalem*, with the *Sacrilegious* ſpoils of all other *Temples* and *Altars* they met with in their way from the

Lyſimach. ap. *Joſeph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1058. G. So *Eupolemus* derives *Hieroſolyma* quaſi ἱερὸν Σολομῶνος, ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. ix.

Etymo-

Etymology of *Hierosolyma quasi* ἱερόσυλα. Who knows also but he might himself ather a thing he was so willing should rove true from the very *Hebrew* name f *Gideon*? It may be he might think it have some affinity with the ירעני ren- red by the LXXII. ἐπιμοιδοὶ and τερατο ρτοι, which none can doubt to have been roper to the *Superstitious Priest-hoods* of hose times, of which kind it is most like- this Heathen would make that of *Gi- eons*. As for the Letter G, where it ands for ע, there it is frequently neg- cted, and even where it stands for ג, it does here, yet it is easily changed for other Letter of the same *Organ*, as י is. ut, if we must needs take in the ג, yet e might possibly collect the same from גר the root of גרעון. If it signifie to *estroy*, we know the *Sacrifices* were *Sym- ls* of *destruction*, either as acknowledg- d due for past crimes, or as imprecated case of any new violation of *Faith* for e future, as in those which were used the making of *Covenants*. Accordingly e word διχοτομεῖν is used for *destruction*, o doubt in allusion to the ἐντόμια which ere cut into *two pieces* for the *Covenanters* pass through. But if it signifie to di- de, that is yet most properly the *Priests*

Vid. *Selden* de Diis *Syr.* Syntagm. 1. c. 2. & *Buxtorf.*

St. *Matth.* xxiv. 51.

 Office,

Office, whence the Notion of ὀρθοτομεῖν λόγον in the Apoſtle, applyed to *Sacrifice* *Gen.* iv. 7. in the LXXII. Whether by dividing we underſtand the dividing the whole for the Parties to paſs through or the dividing the back (whence the Notion of περιχωλισμένα in the Apoſtle to look into the Entrails, or the dividing the Fat to Gods part to be burnt, not reſerving it to themſelves, of which the famous Story of *Prometheus* among the *Heathens*, which is ſuppoſed moſt properly to belong to the Caſe of *Cain*.

Ap. *Heſiod.* Theogon.

§. XL. It was alſo further uſual in thoſe Precedents, whom our pretended Author ſeems to emulate in Forging this work, to begin their *Antiquities* with a Philoſophical Κοσμογενία. So had *Moſes*, whoſe Tranſlation by the LXXII. very probably firſt ſet the reſt upon it. So had *Beroſus* as appears by what we have from *Alexander Polyhiſtor* out of his Firſt Book. So *Manetho*'s in his Book *Sothis*, the ſame it ſhould ſeem with his ἱερᾷ βίβλῳ, in which was contained his *Theologia*, another name of the Myſtical accounts of thoſe Firſt *Originals*, and it may be the ſame with the Φυσιολογικὰ mentioned by *Suidas*, and ſeem to have been alſo the beginning of his Hiſtory. Thus therefore *Philo* alſo thought

In *Euſeb.* Gr. p. 6. In *Euſeb.* Gr. p. 6. & de Pr. Ev. II. p. 44. C.

Voce Μανεθών.

hought it convenient to begin his *San-*
oniathon with a Philoſophical, but My-
cal account of the beginning of the
orld. And here alſo the *Ægyptian*
otions had generally obtained. I have
ewn how *Beroſus* and the *Phœnicians*
me to pretend to them. I have alſo
ewn how the Doctrine even of *Moſes*
me to be taken into them. But it ſeems
have been the cuſtom of the *Ægypti-*
s, to father all their Arts and Monu-
ents, and Sacred Conſtitutions on *Her-*
s. Thence ſo many thouſand Books
cribed to him in *Jamblichus*. Nor was
only taken up by them. It was uſual
thoſe times to father the Monuments of
Sect on the firſt Author of it. Thus the
olden Verſes, and other works among
e *Pythagoreans* aſcribed to *Pythagoras*,
ho yet is ſaid to have written
*) nothing, and that with
deſign that his Diſciples
ight not read, but live ac-
rding to his Injunctions.
hus *Plato*'s Diſcourſes father-
on *Socrates* who yet diſ-
wned (*) his being the Au-
or of many things there at-
buted to him. Thus (*) *Za-*
aſtres's works kept ſecret a-

De Myſt. *Ægypt.* & *Chald.*

* *Joſeph.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. 1046. E. *Lucian* de laſc. in ſalut. S. *Hieronym.* adv. *Ruſin.* *Plutarch.* de Fort. *Alexand.* L. 1. p. 328. A. *Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag.* p. 208. *Claudian.* *Mam.* de Stat. Anim. L. 11. c. 3. (*) *Laert.* L. 111. Platon. p. 78. B. The ſame *Athenæus* ſays concerning *Gorgias* and *Phædon* Deipnoſ. L. xi. c. 15. p. 505. 2. 507. B. (*) *Clem. Al.* Str. 1. p. 304. D.

mong the Disciples of *Prodicus*, a shrewd suspicion of their being Forged by them. And this modish way of those times was in all likelihood, the occasion of so many Supposititious Works Forged by the Primitive Hereticks under the name of the *Apostles*. So also (*) *Enoch* being owned by the *Babylonians* for the Author of *Judicial Astrology*, and other Arts and Sciences, being pretended to have been revealed to his Son *Mathuselah* by an *Angel*, was in all likelihood the occasion of Forging the Prophecy of *Enoch*, and those Discoveries pretended in it by the Ἐγρήγοροι, though it also appears that the Books of *Mercury* favoured the same accounts of the fall of those Angels, because the *Babylonians* and *Ægyptians* both pretended to the same Traditions at *Heliopolis*. But in no sort of Writing was this more frequent than in their (1) *Dialogues*, which was the Form generally observed in these pretended Works of *Mercury*. And I cannot tell, but these same Traditions of the *Heliopolitanes* were so far countenanced by the *Jews* themselves, as their own Revealed Religion would give leave. The account of *Moses*'s Expedition into *Æthiopia*, and several other things much for his advantage, was taken

(*) *Eupolem.* ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

Fragm. ap. *Stob.* Eclog. Phyſ. & *Lactant.* Div. Inſt. ii. 15, 16.

(1) Expreſly owned by *Cicero* Ep. ad *Varron.* ante Quæſt. Academ. & *Macrob.* Saturnal. L. 1. c. 1.

b

by *Artapanus* from the *Heliopolitanes*, and greedily followed by *Josephus*, which shews no ill understanding among them. So also does the *Jews* choosing that place above all others, to build their *Ægyptian* Temple of *Onias*, I mean at the *Heliopolitane Leontopolis* in contradistinction to *Leontopolis*, that was the head of a distinct νομὸς. Nor is there any heed to be taken of the *Rabbins* who place it in *Alexandria*, though I believe, by *Alexandria* they mean the whole *Ægyptian* Colony of *Jews*, in opposition to their Colonies in other Countries.

Artapan. apud *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27. p. 432. D. *Joseph.* Ant. ii. 5.

Joseph. Ant. xii. 15. xiii. 6. xx. 8. Bell. Jud. vii. 30.

Vid. *Selden* de Success. in Pontif. Heb. L. ii. c. 8.

XLI. THIS *Ægyptian Philosopher* therefore, being that which was ingredient in most of the received Κοσμογονίαι, at least being pretended and conceived to be so, how different soever the accounts were, which were pretended from that same Original; therefore *Philo Byblius* also thought it fit to take it into his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. And because he had found it Fathered on Authors who so little agreed concerning the Particulars of it, where it was to be had, and who must therefore some of them be certainly mistaken; it was therefore necessary to pre-

tend to some very *certain means* of *Information*. Accordingly he also pretends to the *Writings*, not the Pillars of *Taautus* or *Mercury*. Which, by the way, makes it suspicious that he took his Information from the Books as Published from the *Heliopolitane* Pillars, seeing he does not himself, so much as pretend to the Original Pillars themselves; and yet to secure his Credit from being only at the *Second hand*, he pretends that *Mercury* caused them to be written Originally, not in Pillars, but in Books. But because so many before him who had pretended to those same *Writings*, had yet mistaken in *Interpreting* them; he therefore contrives a likely account how they might have a likely occasion of such mistakes, and yet himself be free from the Suspicion of the like *Errors*. He pretends therefore that the first *Writings* of *Mercury*, had extricated the *Philosophical* accounts of the first *Originals* of things, from the *Mythological* Arts of concealment, wherein *Antiquity* had involved them; and that it was some while after, but yet before any communication with the *Greeks*, that the Priests had again involved them. Which yet being done before *Orpheus*'s time, by whose means they came to the *Greeks*, was a plain occasion

occasion how the *Greek* Writers, who followed those latter accounts darkened purposely by the Priests, might be mistaken. Because they had nothing to inform them but these designedly obscure *Allegories*, which were both capable of many senses in themselves; and if any certain sense had been preserved, yet it had not been easily discoverable by the *Greeks* without the Priests, who, as I said, were not forward to communicate any thing of that nature to *Strangers*.

§. XLII. AND by the same means he had also provided an account how the *Ægyptians* themselves might be mistaken concerning their own Philosophy. For those Priests, who first involved them, are said to have delivered them down thus obscured, both to their own *Successors*, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιβατικοῖς, that is, *to such as were initiated* in their *Mysteries*, as I believe *Vigerus* has rightly rendred it. It seems then, that they must not have been supposed to have cleared them, even to such as were *initiated*, which sure they would have done, if themselves had preserved any certain Tradition concerning them. Accordingly they are supposed to have continued under this obscurity, till (after many Generations from *Taautus*) Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. i. x. p. 39. C.

Ib. p. 40. B.

Surmu-

Surmubelus and *Thuro* are ſaid to have again unriddled them. So I underſtand thoſe words of *Philo Byblius*; ἀλληγορίαις ἐπεσκιασμένην τὴν Θεολογίαν ἐφώτισαν. For this ſeems to have been the Notion of that Sacred term φωτισμὸς, as it is uſed in the counterfeit Writings of *Mercury* (whom this Author follows) and the Pen-men of the *New-Teſtament*, and other ſuch Writers of that Age, for the *Revelation* of *Myſteries*. I ſuppoſe from that Literal δᾳδουχία and φωτισμὸς, and withdrawing of the *Vail* before the Shrine of the Image by the Ἱεροφάντης, which were in the ordinary courſe of *Initiation* to be uſed to thoſe who were brought into the dark *Adyta*, and initiated in the higher ſort of *Initiation* called Ἐποπτεία. Theſe therefore I ſuſpect to have been pretended for the Authors of the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμουνίων γράμματα, to which this Author pretended, as has already been obſerved. Wherein if I be not miſtaken, it will than be further ſuſpicious, that theſe Authors themſelves did not ſo diſcover them as to make them common to the prophane *Vulgar*, but only ſo as to retrieve the *Traditions* of the *Prieſts*, which had probably, by that time, quite miſcarried, after they had been ſo long reſerved in their *Breaſts*, and intruſted only

to

to *Oral-Tradition*. For, if these discoveries had been designed for the *Vulgar*, the *Writings* which contained them, would not have been styled Απόκρυφα, (the proper term for *Mystical Writings*) nor confined to the Ἄδυτα, and by that means rendred inaccessible to *uninitiated Persons*, as they are supposed to have been. Besides that, by the present extant Epistle of *Ammon*, it appears that the *Ammonians* must not have been for divulging their *Mysteries*.

§. XLIII. AND in giving this account how all that had before him, written on this Subject, might have been mistaken, he at the same time secured his own Authority from the like Exceptions. For having pretended before, that *Taautus* had written his Books clear from those *Mythologies* and *Allegories* wherein they had been involved by the *Priests*, and were afterwards again involved till they were a second time unriddled by *Surmubelus* and *Thuro*; and having made his *Sanchoniathon* derive his Information immediately, both from *Taautus*'s own Books, and from the Books of those *Expositors*, who afterwards retrieved his way of speaking clearly without *Allegories*: He had hereby secured himself of two things

of

of great moment for recommending his *Credit*. One was, that his *Informations* were derived from clear and unobſcured *Originals*, not from *Allegorical* and Second-hand accounts, from them who had no mind to be underſtood by thoſe to whom they communicated their *Myſteries*. Another was that, even for thoſe *Originals* themſelves, he did not depend on a ſingle Authority. The conſent of the *Writings* of *Mercury*, with thoſe of the *Ammonians*, were to be mutual atteſtations of the *Sincerity* of each (at leaſt would be pleaded as ſuch by him) that neither the Original Writings of *Taautus*, nor thoſe retrievements from the *Ammonians*, might ſeem ſuſpitious of being the Fictions of thoſe who *firſt* produced them. For having pretended them to be from diſtant *Writers*, and diſtant places, and *Sacred* inacceſſible *Records*; it would be pretended that there could not have been that *Communication* between them, as to make them able to agree in Forgeries. Yet was not this excluding of *Allegories* to be underſtood ſo, as if he had avoided all *Fables*; but particularly with reſpect to the *Stoical* way, whether by them derived to the later *Ægyptians*, or borrowed from them. That was to *Allegorize*

gorize their first Histories into a Κοσμογονία, a Systeme of *Natural Philosophy*, to make *Jupiter* signifie the *Æther*, *Juno* the *Air*, *Vesta* the *Earth*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. and so to *Allegorize* the History of the *Actions* of those *Persons* into a History of *Nature*, as if indeed there had never been such *Actions* or *Persons*, but only that the several *Elements* of *Nature* had been *Mystically* represented by such *Names*, and the *Phænomena* of *Nature* had, by a *Poetical Prosopopœia*, been turned into a *Romance*. That these were indeed the *Allegories* designed by *Philo Byblius*, appears by these words of his: Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν νεώτατοι τῶν ἱερολόγων, τὰ μὲν γεγονότα πράγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπεπέμψαντο, ἀλληγορίας καὶ μύθους ἐπινοήσαντες, καὶ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς παθήμασι συγγένειαν πλασάμενοι, μυστήρια κατέστησαν, καὶ πολὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπῆγον τύφον ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως πρὸ συνορᾶν τὰ καθ' ἀλήθειαν γενόμενα. *Philo Bybl.* ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 9., And again, Ἀλληγορήσας, τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἀναμίξας, &c. Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. L. x. p 39. C. And what with graceful mixtures of *Poetical fancy*, in the most Antient *Writers* of their *First Originals*, who were generally *Poets*; what with that delight of the *Antients* in *Parables*, and in vesting their *Parables* with *Historical* and likely *Circumstances*; what with that ordinary Method of these *Mystical Writers*, who usually made way for their *Allegories*,

Allegories by catching at little occasions of confuting the *Historical Truth* of what they designed to *Allegorize* (wherein we see them imitated by *Philo*, *Origen*, and the other *Antients* who first began to practice this way with the *Scriptures*) I say with all these ways, they made it indeed seem likely, if not concerning all that was said of those *Persons*, yet concerning many of them, that they were not so much as designed for Historical Truths, but only for *Allegorical Representation*. Yet these not being distinguishable from their designed Histories, at least not in later times after the obliteration of the *Original Traditions*; and being withal delivered on the same *Authority* which delivered the designed Histories; must therefore render all their Histories liable to just Suspicion.

§. XLIV. NOR does it seem to have been the way of *Allegorizing* only, that *Philo* found fault with in the *Greek* Writers, and that uncertainty of their Histories which necessarily followed thereupon; but also the indecorousness of their *Allegories* to their *Deities*, which the *Epicureans* and *Jews* before, but now in *Philo*'s time, the *Christians* had lately made great advantage of, for exposing

the

he received Religions. When he makes *Anobret* (designed the same with *Sarah*) ἡ ἐπωνύμιος νύμφη. The very name of *Nymph* is *Allegorical*, and in the *Philosophical Allegories*, of a peculiar signification. This therefore *Philo* takes particular notice of, that from these *Allegories* of the *Phœnician* Priests, the *Greeks* had taken occasion to set up those which were so very offensive, and gave so great advantage to their common Adversaries. Vid. *Porphyr.* de Antr. Nymphar.

Εἰδὼν Ἡσίοδος, ὅτι κυκλικοὶ πεπυσμένοι θεογονίας, γιγαντομαχίας, καὶ Τιτανομαχίας ἔπλασαν ἰδίας ἐπιμελὲς οἷς συμπειρασόμενοι, ἐξενίκησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. *Philo* ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9.

These were the *Allegories* so much decryed, not only by *Adversaries*, but disowned by the *Philosophers* generally, and such generally as, with any judgment, undertook the defence of the received Religions: That the *Gods* should have a beginning, and be *Born* by the Conjunction of *Males* and *Females* like other *Mortals*, (this he means by their Θεογονίαι) That they should be molested by *Wars*, and reduced to so great *extremities*, as the Fablers pretended, in the Wars with the *Giants*, and *Typhon* and *Enceladus* and the *Titans* (those were the Γιγαντομαχίαι and Τιτανομαχίαι) That they should *Emasculate* one another as *Saturn* is pretended to have

have ſerved *Ouranus*, and *Jupiter* his Father *Saturn* (thoſe are the Ἐκτομαὶ here meant.) Theſe the wiſeſt Men looked on, not only as corruptions of their Hiſtories, but as reproaches to their *Gods*, and Religions. *Plato* diſowned them, and therefore ſends *Homer* Crowned out of his Common-wealth. So did *Heraclides*, and generally the *Stoicks*, who for this very reaſon turned them into *Allegory*. So *Plutarch*, *Proclus* and *Macrobius*. And therefore here *Philo* thought he might do an acceptable piece of ſervice to the common cauſe of *Philoſophy* and *Paganiſm* in general, if he could from the *Originals* of theſe Fictions, ſhew that they were intended for no other but *Fictions*, by thoſe who firſt invented them; and that they had no grounds in their Firſt and moſt ſimple, and moſt creditable *Traditions* and *Hiſtories*, but were ſuper-added by thoſe who neither did, nor could pretend to any new means of *Information*, and by this means diſoblige their common cauſe, from the defence of what the common conſent of their Wiſe men had granted, to be indeed ſo very indefenſible.

De Allegor. *Homer.* *Plutarch.* de Audiend. Poet. de *Iſ.* & *Oſrid.* p. 355. 358. Procl. Theol. Plat. Lib. 1. c. 4. *Macrob.* Somn. Scip. L. 1. c. 2.

§. XLV. HE pretends therefore, in his own *Hiſtory*, to give us, from the fore-

mentioned

mentioned Records, the Historical Truth concerning those Antient *Persons* and *Actions* of the *Phœnicians*, free from those additional passages concerning them, which were only invented for designs of *Allegory*, whether by the *Greeks* or the *Phœnician* Priests themselves. Yet neither so does his performance agree with his undertaking. However it comes to pass (whether through the *headlesness* of *Philo*, or his *Injudiciousness*, in his choice out of extant Histories, what he was to father on his *Sanchoniathon*) we have some things intermixed, which neither are likely to have been true, nor to have been designed for such by the Authors; may seem to have been designed for no other than *Allegorical* Senses, and that in the worst most indefensible way of *Allegorizing*, from which he had pretended to vindicate their received Religion. He makes his *Saturn Emasculate* his Father *Uranus*. Here is one of the *Ennui* which he had before reckoned among the most scandalous sorts of *Allegories*. But this he may possibly pretend to have been done by his *Man Saturn*, who was afterwards by mistake made a *God*, especially as the same *God* implyed not a *Divine* Honour only, but also a *Divine Nature*. And con-

cerning the *Man* it might have been Historically true, and designed for no more by his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. But what shall we say to that which follows, where he makes the Blood that flowed from the Wound of *Ouranus* to have *passed into the Springs and Rivers?* What? one Man's Blood, and from such a Wound as that was, to have flowed into the *Fountains* and *Rivers?* Certainly this could have been meant for no other but an *Allegory*. It is like what is told concerning *Osiris* among the *Ægyptians*, and the Tears of *Sophia* among the *Valentinians*, who seem to have borrowed much of their *Heresie* from the *Ægyptians*, where it first appeared. And I can hardly doubt, but that this was intended by the *Authors* from whom he took it, to shew the true *Original* of *Fountains* and *Rivers*, that the *Waters beneath the Firmament*, as the Scripture distinguishes them, were derived from those *above the Firmament*; the *Fountains of the Deep* supplied from the *Windows of Heaven*; the *Fountains* and the *Rivers* nourished by the *Rain* which came from Οὐρανὸς, in the larger Notion of it, as it includes the *Air* also. And possibly considering this as taken from *Taautus* an *Ægyptian*, by the *Rivers* might be meant the

Ἀπέσταξεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τῶν αἰδοίων εἰς τὰς πηγὰς, καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν τὰ ὕδατα. ap. *Euseb.* Ib. p. 38. B.

the several *Ostia* and *Cuts* of *Nilus*, from which no doubt all the *Fountains* of *Ægypt* proceeded, which were accordingly turned also into *Blood*, when *Nilus* was so; and then he might allude to the Tradition of the *Ægyptians*, that *Nilus* was derived from *Heaven*, as *Diodorus* tells us.

So *Homer* calls it Διϊπετῆ.

Πεὶν γ' ὅτ' ἂν Αἰγύπτοιο Διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο Ὀδυσσ. Δ.
Αὖτις ὕδωρ ἔλθῃς.

And again,

Ἀψ δ' εἰς Αἰγύπτοιο Διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο Ib.
Ἐτῆσα νέῃς.

Αἰγύπτος with him is *Nilus*, And I am apt to think that the reason why he called it Διϊπετῆ, was because of all those many Opinions which were afterwards raised concerning the Rise of *Nilus*, he rather inclined to that which derived it from the *Air* which is called *Jupiter* and Οὐρανὸς, as I said in the larger Sense, whether from the *Rain* or the melted *Snow*, both of which belong to *Jupiter* in the sense now mentioned. The most *Antient* and most *Popular* Opinions are most likely to have been intended by the *Mythologers*. And to prove that this was so, we cannot have a fitter Testimony than this of *Homer*. He is one of the most *Antient* of the *Pagan* Writers. As a *Poet*, he is most suited to *Vulgar* capacity, and of nearest affinity to the *Mythologists*. He was an *Ægyptian* Born, of

the *Ægyptian Thebes*, if we may believe *Heliodorus*. But whether we believe him or not, yet it is more unanimously agreed, that he learned most of his Philosophical Notions from the *Ægyptians*. Whence it will follow, that this was most probably the *Popular* received opinion among the *Ægyptians* in the time of *Homer*. And of the Two Opinions (which as I said, do make for this purpose) one of them was received by most of the *Greatest* and most *Antient* even among the *Ægyptians* themselves. That the *Nilus* had its Original from *Rain*, was the Opinion of (1) *Aristotle*, (2) *Agatharchides*, and of the *Ægyptian Priests*, as (3) *Eudoxus* assures us. That it was from Snow was the sense of (4) *Democritus*, (5) *Anaxagorus*, (6) *Æschylus*, (7) *Sophocles*, (8) *Euripides*, and all (9) *Antiquity*, mentioned also by (10) *Lucretius* and (11) *Mela*, whether soever of the two be true, or was thought so by the *Antient Ægyptians*, or by the most *Antient Philosophers* (who in all likelihood borrowed what they said concerning it from the *Ægyptians*) is equally subservient, to shew what might have been the actual sense of the pretended *Hermes* in this *Allegory*.

(1) *Aristotle*. Anonym. ap. Phot. Cod. ccxlix.
(2) *Agatharchides*. Diodor. *Sicul*. Bibl. L. 1. *Theopk. Simocatta* ap. *Phot*. Cod. LXV.
(3) Ap. *Plutarch*. de Plac. Philos. L. iv. c. 1.
(4 5) *Diodor. Sic*. Bib. L. 1.
(6 7 8 9) *Senec*. Nat. Quæst. iv. 2.
(10) *Lucret*. L. vi.
(11) *Mela*. l. 9.
Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. 1.

lagers. And that *Nilus* is derived from the Blood of the *Genitals* of *Ouranus*, rather than any other part, might have been to express the *Fruitfulness* of this *River* above all others. The *Slime* it brought along with it, manured the Land for *Corn*, and was withal so very *Prolifick*, as that it engendred several *Animals*, and made *Women* fruitful that used the Water, and gave occasion to the Fancy of those Antient *Atheists*, who thought the first Men produced out of the *Slime* of *Nilus*. Now if I have hit the meaning right in this instance, this will also afford a new Argument against our pretended *Sanchoniathon*. Either he pretended falsly that *Taautus* was free from these *Physiological Allegories*, especially from the *Scandalous* sort of them, and this was a mistake that must needs have been *willful*, and with ill *design*. He must needs have known from the Books themselves, if he had indeed any such Books, whether any such matter was so much as pretended by him. If it was *pretended*, but *falsly*; that will ruine the Credit of *Taautus* himself, and make him suspicious of being forged by some Modern concerned Author, which will consequently ruine the Credit of *Sanchoniathon* also, if he pretend to know Fictions invented so long after

his own time. Or else he did not *confine* himself to those Informations of *Taautus*, which were indeed free from such *Allegories*. And this will also be another conviction of his *Unsincerity* in pretending what he did not intend to perform. In all likelihood it was *Philo* who here betrayed himself, and forgot the Person he was to Act under the name of *Sanchoniathon*. Which will be a conviction of his disingenuous dealing in this, as well as his other pretended means of *Information*.

§. XLVI. THIS seems to have been this Authors design in pretending to the now mentioned means of *Information*. If I might presume yet farther, to guess why he pitched on the very name of *Sanchoniathon*, on whom he was desirous to Father his Forgeries; I do not know whether it might not have been in imitation of the *Ægyptian Sonchis*, to whom *Solon* and *Pythagoras* are said to have been beholden for what discoveries were made to them of the *Ægyptian Philosophy*. He is stiled an Ἀρχιερεύς, and Λογιώτατος τῶν ἱερέων, one of the most Learned of their Priests of *Sais*, Characters excellently qualifying him for understanding their *Sacred Records*, those especially of his *Country-man* the *Ægyptian Mercury*. But yet because he was to make him as well

Solen. Plutarch. in *Solon.* & de *Isid.* & *Osirid.* *Pythagoras Clem. Alex.* Strom. 1.

well as *Mercury*, pass for *Phœnicians*; therefore he might think it fit a little to disguise his name with a termination different from that whereby he was known to the *Alexandrians*, as he had done in the name of *Mercury*. He calls him designedly *Taautus*, whom he confesses that the *Ægyptians* called Θωὼθ, the *Alexandrians* Θωὺθ. Why might he not accordingly call him *Sanchoniathon*, whom the *Ægyptians* called *Sonchis*, especially if by such a change he could draw such an Argument for his credit from his very name, as *Bochart* conceives? This *Sonchis* had taught *Solon* the Ἀτλαντικὸς λόγος. This seems to have been no other than the Ἀτλαντίων Θεολογία in *Diodorus Siculus*, and in all likelihood was the same with that of *Mercury*, as this of *Sanchoniathon* was professedly. For those *Atlantii* challenged *Mercury* for theirs, and made him the Son of *Maja* the Daughter of their famous *Astrological Atlas*, and it may be this was the reason why our pretended *Sanchoniathon* also thought fit to challenge *Atlas* as a *Phœnician*, that they might also have the double Title to that same *Philosophy*, on account of *Atlas* as well as of *Mercury*. I am apt to suspect that the occasion of this *Philosophy* of the *Atlantii* might have been taken from the men-

Diodor. Sic. Bibl. L. iii. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. L. ii.

tion of the *Atlantick Iſland* in *Plato*'s *Timæus*. This ſome Author well known to *Diodorus*, might (in imitation of the *Philoſophical Mythologies*, then ſo much in faſhion, and particularly of *Euemerus* who wrote his *Sacred Hiſtory* from a like pretended Περιηγησις of a fictious *Iſland* called *Panchaia*) have made the Subject of new Diſcoveries. He might have Perſonated ſome who had found it, and in deſcribing the place and the People, it very well became the *Poem*, to have given an account of their Sentiments, on thoſe Subjects concerning which that Age was ſo very inquiſitive and curious. Yet it alſo became it to derive them from *Atlas*, and ſo to fit their Opinions to his Perſon. Or perhaps it might rather have been that yet more antient account of *Solon*, concerning the *Atlantes* in Verſe, from whom *Plato* took his firſt occaſion, but (as *Plutarch* tells us) never lived to finiſh it. It ſhould ſeem the deſign of theſe *Atlantick* Diſcourſes both of *Solon* and *Plato* was much larger than that ſmall account given in *Plato*'s *Timæus*. From ſome of theſe, rather than *Timæus*, it is probable that *Ælian* had his Tradition that the *Kings* of *Atlantes* that were of *Neptunes* race, wore their Diadems of *Hee-goats* as their *Queens* did of *Shee-goats* hairs. The

Plutarch. Solon. p. 92, 96.

Ælian. de Animal. xv. 2.

Nation

lation of the *Atlantes* are mentioned by e Antients as inhabiting at the foot of ount *Atlas*, the Ὠκεανὸν οἰκοῦντες in *Ælian*, on whom these Traditions were imme-iately Fathered. And the Country there-outs, as it is described by the same *Ælian* robably from the same Traditions, was ery pleasant and *Sacred*, and upon both counts, very fit for the Scene of such a *oetick Philosophy*. But though that might ve been the *Poetick Scene*, yet the *Ægyp-ans* seem to have been the *Poets* that con-ived these Stories, that we may not ad-ire how it should agree with the Do-rine of *Mercury*. For as *Plato* had it from *olon*, so *Solon* seems to have pretended it o higher than *Sonchis* the *Ægyptian*. And onsidering the *Antiquity* pretended of hese *Atlantians*, no *Nation* could or did retend to such *Information* concerning a ation situate in the *West* of *Africa* as the *Egyptians*. Besides *Enoch* was taken for the me with this famous *Astrological Atlas*, as *upolemus* tells us. How could they have aken up this conjecture, but from the a-reement they had observed between the Doctrines of *Atlas*, and those of *Enoch*? How could they guess at the Doctrine of *noch*, but by the *Apocryphal Writings* then xtant under his Name? The *Atlantick*

Herodot. Melpom. *Mela.* 14. 8. *Plin.* N. Hist. v. 18.

Ælian. Anim. vii. 2.

Eupolemus ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

Doctrines

Doctrines therefore agreed with those
the *Book* of *Enoch*, and that those agree
also with the Forgeries then extant unde
the name of *Mercury*, has already been ob
§. 40. served. So that *Sonchis* taught *Solon* no
thing but what had very well become th
Person of *Sanchoniathon*.

§. XLVII. THUS I have endeavoured t
give an account of the design of this whol
Fiction, and that such a one as might agre
both with the *Time* and *Person* of *Phil*
Byblius. I have shewn what liberty th
Principles of those *Philosophers* allowe
them for the Practice of such *disingenuities*
I have shewn how little such an Author a
Sanchoniathon was known before the tim
of *Philo Byblius*, notwithstanding all th
search that had been made into the *Phœni*
cians Records, and how little *regarded* after
I have shewn how little he savoured of th
Antient *simplicity*, and how much of th
Modern Emulations. I have shewn how lit
tle creditable he is in his pretended mean
of *Information*, and how far from that sin
gular *Love* of *Truth*, for which he would
have it believed, that his *Sanchoniathon* wa
so particularly remarkable. I have shewn
that those means themselves are also suspici
ons, either that they never were extant, a
the *Memories* of *Gideon*; or that they were

Coun-

Counterfeited themſelves, as the *Writings of Taautus* and the *Ammonians*, and that long after the time that *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have lived in; that he could have followed no *Jewiſh Records* in his accounts of *Jewiſh* matters; and that his following the Writings of *Mercury* and the *Ammonians*, divulged ſo long after his pretended Age, are rather Convictions of his *Falſe-hood*, than a Recommendation of his *Credit*. I have endeavoured alſo, as far as I could gueſs from the *Circumſtances* he lived in, to give a particular account of the *occaſion* and *deſign* of each particular obſerved in the management of this whole *Fraud*. And I know not what can be deſired more for the Conviction of it at this diſtance of time, and loſs of *Original Monuments*.

§. XLVIII. NOR can I ſee that this diſcovery will in the leaſt injure the Cauſe for which thoſe *Pious* as well as *Learned* Perſons have been concerned, who have hitherto made uſe of this Author for *expounding* or *confirming* ſome *Hiſtorical* or *Philoſophical* paſſages of *Scripture*. If there were any of theſe *Heathen Antiquities*, that could either pretend to the *Age* of the *Scriptures*, or to that even *Domeſtick* Evidence of being *genuine*, there might then be ſome

pretence

pretence for reconciling or confirming some passages of the Scriptures by them for their use who did not grant the advantage of the *Sacred* Writers above their own in regard of their *Divine Inspiration*. But we never hear of any of those *Heathen* accounts of things mentioned in the Scriptures, before the Translation of the LXXII put them into an *Emulation*. Then it was that *Berosus* and *Manetho*, and *Menander* and *Laius* first made and published their Enquiries. No mention of the *Chaldæan Xisuthrus*, nor of the *Ægyptian Hycsi*, nor of *Abraham* nor *Moses*, nor the *general Deluge* in *Ctesias* or *Xenophon*, or *Herodotus*, or any of those more Antient *certainly-genuine* Writers. When they did publish them, the very *Records* pretended for them make them suspicious of Forgery. They were pretended only from *Sacred Pillars* extant in *Adyta*, and these very *Pillars* challenged in several places, yet not accessible by any who had been desirous to convict them. But the Scriptures were only then *Translated*. The *Originals* were extant long before in *Books accessible* and intelligible by any who had the curiosity to learn their *Tongue*. I do not insist on the *Translation* pretended to have been in *Plato*'s time, because I find no better Arguments for it

than

than guesses that *Plato* had some things from the Sacred Writings, which I believe he had not, besides that such a *Supposition* is directly contrary to the much better attested Story of *Aristæus* concerning the Translation performed by the command of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. I rather choose those more Antient instances of *Theopompus* the Historian, and *Theodectes* the Poet, who had seen and understood these Books of *Jews*, before the Translation of *Philadelphus*, as we are assured by *Demetrius Phalereus* in *Aristæus*, besides that even the Book of *Daniel*, one of the latest of them, was yet shewn to *Alexander* the *Great*, if we may believe *Josephus*. So that even from the *Greeks* we have as early Evidence of their being known, as we have of them being enquired after, or of their being in a capacity to understand them, and there can be no reason to expect earlier. Besides the repugnancy of those other Nations to each other, and of the different Authors even of the same Nation, were certain Arguments that they did not write from the same uniform and true *Records*, as the *Jews* who all agreed in the same Books, as *Josephus* observes. And for the *Pentateuch*, that of the *Samaritanes* must in all likelyhood

Ap. *Josep.* Ant. xii. 2.

Ant. xi. 8.

Cont. *Apion.* L. 1. p. 1036. F.

hood have been received from them before the the time of the LXXII, both because the *Samaritanes* were before that so exasperated by the *Jews*, as that it is not likely they would receive any such thing from them, and because it should seem the *Prophets* were not then collected by the *Jews* that they might have been delivered to them, and because they still preserve it in the *Old Hebrew* Character, not in that which was afterwards introduced by *Esdras*. Upon all these accounts it cannot be thought reasonable either to oppose these *Heathen* accounts to the Scriptures, or to think that any thing can be made more creditable in the Scriptures, because it is confirmed by the consent of so exceptionable Authorities. I have rather shewn that the occasion of their agreeing in *Philosophical* matters, was rather their imitating and allowing the Authority of *Moses*, and making him the Standard of their several κοσμογονίαι. Which may indeed be of use for shewing Historically how that part of *Moses* was actually understood from those times wherein these Heathen accounts were first produced; but can be of no farther use for shewing either the sense of *Moses*, or how the anti-

ent

ent first Deliverers of his Doctrine did actually understand him, than as these things may be inferred, or presumed, from the actual sense of those later times, wherein these *Heathen Antiquities* first appeared.

F I N I S.

---

first Deliverers of his Doctrine did actually understand him, than as these things may be inferred, or presumed, from the actual state of those later times, wherein these Writers Antiquities first appeared.

FINIS.